

# THE STANDARD

NO. 76-VOL. NO. 24.

NEW YORK, SATURDAY, JUNE 16, 1888.

PRICE FIVE CENTS

"The Standard" is sent this week to a number of persons whose friends have paid to have the paper forwarded to them for four weeks in the hope that they may be induced to read it, examine the principles it advocates and become regular subscribers. Those who receive the paper without having ordered it will understand that it has been sent in this manner and will be sent for four successive weeks without charge to them.

Terms of subscription will be found on the fourth page.

## CONTENTS.

Chancellor Birn's Decision.  
Over Population.  
Home Life Disappearing.  
"Debasing" in France.  
Querries and Answers.  
The Boulanger Boom and Its Causes.  
Pen, Past, and Scissors.  
The Law of Labor Strikes.  
The Tariff Delator.  
Limitation of Fortunes.  
St. Louis Sidebar.  
The Great Trade Talk.  
Society Notes.  
Men and Things.  
Electricity in Production and Exchange.  
The Beating of the Drums.  
Louisiana Farmers.  
Turned Off (poem).  
A Morion's Story.  
A Scrap of Railway Talk.  
Song of the High Protectionist (poem).  
To Workingmen.  
Current Thought.  
A Fresh Air Dream.  
Free Trade and the Single Tax.  
Straws Which Show the Wind.

Governor Hill, as was expected from the first, has vetoed the ballot reform bill. He has filed with it a memorandum giving his reasons, which are of the most trivial character. His real reason evidently is that the bill would accomplish just what its friends expect from it—it would kill the political machines.

What the men who are bent upon carrying this great reform have now to do is to show that they propose to vote for it—that they propose, irrespective of party lines, to vote against those who oppose it, and in favor of those who support it. We cannot expect to obtain such a measure from politicians unless we prove to them that we are earnest. The Central labor union, and its sections acting independently, have clearly shown what a hold the desire for this reform has taken upon the working masses of New York. They know from experience that under the present electoral system our politics must create bosses and develop machines, and that the first step to making our government really a government by the people is to take the power of money out of elections, put an end to bribery and intimidation, and give the voter the means of really expressing his will.

But the passage of this bill by the legislature is in itself a great triumph, and what is still more, a similar bill has, in Massachusetts, become law by the signature of Governor Ames, who has the honor which Governor Hill has refused. The workingmen of Boston propose to celebrate the auspicious event. The workingmen of New York can at least show how they regard the temporary defeat of the measure in this state.

The following resolutions adopted by land and labor club No. 1 of Chicago, at its last meeting on June 7, are likely to command themselves to the sober second thought of all who had intended taking part in the proposed single tax conference in that city on the Fourth of July:

In view of the fact that the date of the single tax national conference, July 4, 1888, will be a time of great political excitement, being in the midst of the most important presidential campaign that has occurred in twenty years, when the calm judgment of the conference may possibly be interfered with by the dictates of prejudice.

And in view of the fact that the probable success of the plan upon which our friends in Texas are now working, will, at a later date, be more apparent, and that, therefore, the conference, if postponed to proper time, will have much greater light on an important line of action, than will be possible at the date named in the call:

And in view of the fact that certain gentlemen, claiming to represent the political power of the single tax movement, have, against the advice of the leaders of our reform, and against the wishes of a majority of the rank and file, held a convention and placed a candidate before the people, thereby forestalling the action of the conference, and removing from the arena of discussion the only factor whose immediate settlement is of importance:

Therefore, be it resolved, That land and labor club No. 1 of Illinois hereby requests Warren W. Bailey to postpone the date of the conference to some time subsequent to the November election.

There can be no question that the Chicago men take a wise and conservative view of the matter. Their action meets the approbation of our friends in this vicinity from whom I have heard, and will, I think, commend itself to our friends in all parts of the country.

When, in February, Mr. Samuel W. Williams of Vincennes proposed, through THE STANDARD, that Mr. Warren Worth Bailey should be authorized by the individual requests of a hundred or more single tax men to call a conference on the Fourth of July, there was much uncertainty as to the development of the political situation and much perplexity and uncertainty among our friends; and there was a general feeling that we ought

to meet together and take counsel as to what we should do. But time has made clear much that was then uncertain. The issue on which the two great parties are to join battle is now settled, and there has been among single tax men a crystallization of opinion as to what course they should pursue. The small minority who are determined on going through the forms of independent political action have met at Cincinnati and named candidates. The great majority have come to the conclusion that their part in this campaign is to support the democratic national ticket as representing the free trade side of the struggle. And some—for there are some who, though single tax men in the field of state action, are yet protectionists in the field of national action—have made up their minds to support the republican candidates.

Under these conditions there is now nothing of immediate importance or utility that such a conference could determine. It would be manifestly unwise, so long as there is the slightest difference of opinion among us, for such a gathering to formally endorse either of the old parties or to command or condemn independent political action. The only purpose the conference could serve would be to make acquainted with each other those of our friends who might meet at Chicago and to enable them to consult as to propaganda work in the future. But, as the Chicago club intimates, there could be no worse time for such meeting and consultation than the present. Not merely shall we be able after November to see with much greater clearness what measures it would be best to take for the future, but it is hopeless to bring together in the beginning of a most exciting political campaign men whose minds are full of politics, and expect them to confine themselves, in discussion at least, to matters which have no reference to politics.

If there prevailed anywhere an impression that the gathering at Cincinnati represented the single tax sentiment and that the vote for its nominees would show our strength, then there would be some useful purpose for the conference to serve in countering that impression. But it is so clear that the Cincinnati action represented only a small minority—it having been repudiated even by the Chicago club, of which the Cincinnati nominee is president—that no further repudiation is needed. There is no fear of any one mistaking the failure of Mr. Cowdry to poll a respectable vote for the weakness of the cause which his supporters assume him to represent. But such a gathering as was proposed to be held at Chicago could hardly take place without the matter being at least discussed. And "the least said, the soonest mended." It is not easy for men who have strong feelings with regard to the impending campaign to now view as dispassionately the attitude of those who differ with them, and to talk as coolly about it, as they will be able to do after November. And as whatever may be our present diversities, we should all hope to be together then, it is certainly the part of prudence to do as our Chicago friends suggest and postpone our meeting until that time. We can then certainly have a larger and more useful meeting, and may perhaps be able to make it an international conference, at least to the extent of securing the presence of some of our friends from other countries.

The Chicago land and labor club No. 1 that has adopted these resolutions is the club of which Mr. Cowdry is president, but which has by a large majority adopted resolutions disclaiming any responsibility for putting him in the field and repudiating the Cincinnati action. In this they undoubtedly represent the general feeling of our friends in Chicago and throughout the country, and as representing the majority their opinion that the conference ought to be postponed is of more weight. It is also of more weight as coming from men resident in the place where the conference is to meet, and who could therefore attend it without the expense of time and money which would be required of those who came from a distance. Mr. Bailey, however, in calling the conference, has acted upon the written request of a considerable number of single tax men in all parts of the country. To relieve him of embarrassment it will be well for those who in the beginning authorized him to call this conference to now write withdrawing the authority. Mr. Bailey, who went into this matter at the request of others and with a view of providing a mode for harmonizing differences, has had much labor and anxiety, for which he deserves the thanks of all.

R. Frank Sylvester of Peekskill, N. Y., puts to me four questions, which I give and answer in their order:

(1) Do you advise the single tax men to support the candidates of the democratic party for congress, state offices and members of the legislature? and if not, what would you advise them to do?

I do not.

I advise them in voting for a member of congress to vote for the candidate that will go furthest for free trade, and when both candidates are protectionists, as is likely to be the case in many districts, I advise them to vote in preference for the republican, because to beat democratic protectionists will help make the democratic party a free trade party.

As to state officers and members of the legislature, I advise them to vote for those who have voted for the Australian ballot bill, or will pledge themselves to do so; and to give their support to those who come furthest our way, especially in the exemption of personal property from taxation.

Where there is a doubt, I would advise them to give the benefit of it to the republican party, for the reason that the Australian ballot bill was passed through both houses mainly by the votes of the republican members, was opposed by the majority of the democrats, and has been refused his signature by a democratic governor. I would advise our friends everywhere, between now and election, organizing for that purpose where they can, to address letters to all candidates asking their position on such measures as the ballot bill, the exemption of personal property from taxation, the separation in assessment of land and improvements, and such other measures as may lead in our direction. I would advise them, too, where they can, to push single tax men quietly to the front.

(2) Have you not said, in effect, that free trade without the "single tax" would not be a complete remedy for poverty?

I have said that free trade, as it is commonly understood, would not be a remedy for poverty; I have said this over and over again, and repeat it now. The free trade that will alone do that, is that full free trade which can only be secured by the single tax. But I regard what is commonly called free trade, or even any reduction in our protective tariff, as a step toward the single tax, and I look upon the delusion that labor can be benefited by protection as the greatest of the obstacles that prevent workingmen from seeing what alone can largely and permanently benefit labor.

(3) Have you not said, in effect, that free trade without the "single tax" would not be a complete remedy for poverty?

The great object for which I declared my intention to support Grover Cleveland has already been secured by bringing the economic question into political discussion. What it is now certain will be discussed this year in every newspaper, on every stump, and wherever throughout the country men talk politics, is the question of taxation as related to wages. Even if Mr. Cleveland is defeated and the protectionists win, we will be nearer the object for which we organized the united labor party in Syracuse than the single tax.

The great object for which I declared my intention to support Grover Cleveland has already been secured by bringing the economic question into political discussion. What it is now certain will be discussed this year in every newspaper, on every stump, and wherever throughout the country men talk politics, is the question of taxation as related to wages. Even if Mr. Cleveland is defeated and the protectionists win, we will be nearer the object for which we organized the united labor party in Syracuse than the single tax.

The great object for which I declared my intention to support Grover Cleveland has already been secured by bringing the economic question into political discussion. What it is now certain will be discussed this year in every newspaper, on every stump, and wherever throughout the country men talk politics, is the question of taxation as related to wages. Even if Mr. Cleveland is defeated and the protectionists win, we will be nearer the object for which we organized the united labor party in Syracuse than the single tax.

The great object for which I declared my intention to support Grover Cleveland has already been secured by bringing the economic question into political discussion. What it is now certain will be discussed this year in every newspaper, on every stump, and wherever throughout the country men talk politics, is the question of taxation as related to wages. Even if Mr. Cleveland is defeated and the protectionists win, we will be nearer the object for which we organized the united labor party in Syracuse than the single tax.

The great object for which I declared my intention to support Grover Cleveland has already been secured by bringing the economic question into political discussion. What it is now certain will be discussed this year in every newspaper, on every stump, and wherever throughout the country men talk politics, is the question of taxation as related to wages. Even if Mr. Cleveland is defeated and the protectionists win, we will be nearer the object for which we organized the united labor party in Syracuse than the single tax.

The great object for which I declared my intention to support Grover Cleveland has already been secured by bringing the economic question into political discussion. What it is now certain will be discussed this year in every newspaper, on every stump, and wherever throughout the country men talk politics, is the question of taxation as related to wages. Even if Mr. Cleveland is defeated and the protectionists win, we will be nearer the object for which we organized the united labor party in Syracuse than the single tax.

The great object for which I declared my intention to support Grover Cleveland has already been secured by bringing the economic question into political discussion. What it is now certain will be discussed this year in every newspaper, on every stump, and wherever throughout the country men talk politics, is the question of taxation as related to wages. Even if Mr. Cleveland is defeated and the protectionists win, we will be nearer the object for which we organized the united labor party in Syracuse than the single tax.

The great object for which I declared my intention to support Grover Cleveland has already been secured by bringing the economic question into political discussion. What it is now certain will be discussed this year in every newspaper, on every stump, and wherever throughout the country men talk politics, is the question of taxation as related to wages. Even if Mr. Cleveland is defeated and the protectionists win, we will be nearer the object for which we organized the united labor party in Syracuse than the single tax.

The great object for which I declared my intention to support Grover Cleveland has already been secured by bringing the economic question into political discussion. What it is now certain will be discussed this year in every newspaper, on every stump, and wherever throughout the country men talk politics, is the question of taxation as related to wages. Even if Mr. Cleveland is defeated and the protectionists win, we will be nearer the object for which we organized the united labor party in Syracuse than the single tax.

The great object for which I declared my intention to support Grover Cleveland has already been secured by bringing the economic question into political discussion. What it is now certain will be discussed this year in every newspaper, on every stump, and wherever throughout the country men talk politics, is the question of taxation as related to wages. Even if Mr. Cleveland is defeated and the protectionists win, we will be nearer the object for which we organized the united labor party in Syracuse than the single tax.

The great object for which I declared my intention to support Grover Cleveland has already been secured by bringing the economic question into political discussion. What it is now certain will be discussed this year in every newspaper, on every stump, and wherever throughout the country men talk politics, is the question of taxation as related to wages. Even if Mr. Cleveland is defeated and the protectionists win, we will be nearer the object for which we organized the united labor party in Syracuse than the single tax.

The great object for which I declared my intention to support Grover Cleveland has already been secured by bringing the economic question into political discussion. What it is now certain will be discussed this year in every newspaper, on every stump, and wherever throughout the country men talk politics, is the question of taxation as related to wages. Even if Mr. Cleveland is defeated and the protectionists win, we will be nearer the object for which we organized the united labor party in Syracuse than the single tax.

The great object for which I declared my intention to support Grover Cleveland has already been secured by bringing the economic question into political discussion. What it is now certain will be discussed this year in every newspaper, on every stump, and wherever throughout the country men talk politics, is the question of taxation as related to wages. Even if Mr. Cleveland is defeated and the protectionists win, we will be nearer the object for which we organized the united labor party in Syracuse than the single tax.

The great object for which I declared my intention to support Grover Cleveland has already been secured by bringing the economic question into political discussion. What it is now certain will be discussed this year in every newspaper, on every stump, and wherever throughout the country men talk politics, is the question of taxation as related to wages. Even if Mr. Cleveland is defeated and the protectionists win, we will be nearer the object for which we organized the united labor party in Syracuse than the single tax.

The great object for which I declared my intention to support Grover Cleveland has already been secured by bringing the economic question into political discussion. What it is now certain will be discussed this year in every newspaper, on every stump, and wherever throughout the country men talk politics, is the question of taxation as related to wages. Even if Mr. Cleveland is defeated and the protectionists win, we will be nearer the object for which we organized the united labor party in Syracuse than the single tax.

The great object for which I declared my intention to support Grover Cleveland has already been secured by bringing the economic question into political discussion. What it is now certain will be discussed this year in every newspaper, on every stump, and wherever throughout the country men talk politics, is the question of taxation as related to wages. Even if Mr. Cleveland is defeated and the protectionists win, we will be nearer the object for which we organized the united labor party in Syracuse than the single tax.

The great object for which I declared my intention to support Grover Cleveland has already been secured by bringing the economic question into political discussion. What it is now certain will be discussed this year in every newspaper, on every stump, and wherever throughout the country men talk politics, is the question of taxation as related to wages. Even if Mr. Cleveland is defeated and the protectionists win, we will be nearer the object for which we organized the united labor party in Syracuse than the single tax.

The great object for which I declared my intention to support Grover Cleveland has already been secured by bringing the economic question into political discussion. What it is now certain will be discussed this year in every newspaper, on every stump, and wherever throughout the country men talk politics, is the question of taxation as related to wages. Even if Mr. Cleveland is defeated and the protectionists win, we will be nearer the object for which we organized the united labor party in Syracuse than the single tax.

The great object for which I declared my intention to support Grover Cleveland has already been secured by bringing the economic question into political discussion. What it is now certain will be discussed this year in every newspaper, on every stump, and wherever throughout the country men talk politics, is the question of taxation as related to wages. Even if Mr. Cleveland is defeated and the protectionists win, we will be nearer the object for which we organized the united labor party in Syracuse than the single tax.

The great object for which I declared my intention to support Grover Cleveland has already been secured by bringing the economic question into political discussion. What it is now certain will be discussed this year in every newspaper, on every stump, and wherever throughout the country men talk politics, is the question of taxation as related to wages. Even if Mr. Cleveland is defeated and the protectionists win, we will be nearer the object for which we organized the united labor party in Syracuse than the single tax.

The great object for which I declared my intention to support Grover Cleveland has already been secured by bringing the economic question into political discussion. What it is now certain will be discussed this year in every newspaper, on every stump, and wherever throughout the country men talk politics, is the question of taxation as related to wages. Even if Mr. Cleveland is defeated and the protectionists win, we will be nearer the object for which we organized the united labor party in Syracuse than the single tax.

The great object for which I declared my intention to support Grover Cleveland has already been secured by bringing the economic question into political discussion. What it is now certain will be discussed this year in every newspaper, on every stump, and wherever throughout the country men talk politics, is the question of taxation as related to wages. Even if Mr. Cleveland is defeated and the protectionists win, we will be nearer the object for which we organized the united labor party in Syracuse than the single tax.

The great object for which I declared my intention to support Grover Cleveland has already been secured by bringing the economic question into political discussion. What it is now certain will be discussed this year in every newspaper, on every stump, and wherever throughout the country men talk politics, is the question of taxation as related to wages. Even if Mr. Cleveland is defeated and the protectionists win, we will be nearer the object for which we organized the united labor party in Syracuse than the single tax.

The great object for which I declared my intention to support Grover Cleveland has already been secured by bringing the economic question into political discussion. What it is now certain will be discussed this year in every newspaper, on every stump, and wherever throughout the country men talk politics, is the question of taxation as related to wages. Even if Mr. Cleveland is defeated and the protectionists win, we will be nearer the object for which we organized the united labor party in Syracuse than the single tax.

The great object for which I declared my intention to support Grover Cleveland has already been secured by bringing the economic question into political discussion. What it is now certain will be discussed this year in every newspaper, on every stump, and wherever throughout the country men talk politics, is the question of taxation as related to wages. Even if Mr. Cleveland is defeated and the protectionists win, we will be nearer the object for which we organized the united labor party in Syracuse than the single tax.

The great object for which I declared my intention to support Grover Cleveland has already been secured by bringing the economic question into political discussion. What it is now certain will be discussed this year in every newspaper, on every stump, and wherever throughout the country men talk politics, is the question of taxation as related to wages. Even if Mr. Cleveland is defeated and the protectionists win, we will be nearer the object for which we organized the united labor party in Syracuse than the single tax.

The great object for which I declared my intention to support Grover Cleveland has already been secured by bringing the economic question into political discussion. What it is now certain will be discussed this year in every newspaper, on every stump, and wherever throughout the country men talk politics, is the question of taxation as related to wages. Even if Mr. Cleveland is defeated and the protectionists win, we will be nearer the object for which we organized the united labor party in Syracuse than the single tax.

The great object for which I declared my intention to support Grover Cleveland has already been secured by bringing the economic question into political discussion. What it is now certain will be discussed this year in every newspaper, on every stump, and wherever throughout the country men talk politics, is the question of taxation as related to wages. Even if Mr. Cleveland is defeated and the protectionists win, we will be nearer the object for which we organized the united labor party in Syracuse than the single tax.

The great object for which I declared my intention to support Grover Cleveland has already been secured by bringing the economic question into political discussion. What it is now certain will be discussed this year in every newspaper, on every stump, and wherever throughout the country men talk politics, is the question of taxation as related to wages. Even if Mr. Cleveland is defeated and the protectionists win, we will be nearer the object for which we organized the united labor party in Syracuse than the single tax.

The great object for which I declared my intention to support Grover Cleveland has already been secured by bringing the economic question into political discussion. What it is now certain will be discussed this year in every newspaper, on every stump, and wherever throughout the country men talk politics, is the question of taxation as related to wages. Even if Mr. Cleveland is defeated and the protectionists win, we will be nearer the object for which we organized the united labor party in Syracuse than the single tax.

The great object for which I declared my intention to support Grover Cleveland has already been secured by bringing the economic question into political discussion. What it is now certain will be discussed this year in every newspaper, on every stump, and wherever throughout the country men talk politics, is the question of taxation as related to wages. Even if Mr. Cleveland is defeated and the protectionists win, we will be nearer the object for which we organized the united labor party in Syracuse than the single tax.

The great object for which I declared my intention to support Grover Cleveland has already been secured by bringing the economic question into political discussion. What it is now certain will be discussed this year in every newspaper, on every stump, and wherever throughout the country men talk politics, is the question of taxation as related to wages. Even if Mr. Cleveland is defeated and the protectionists win, we will be nearer the object for which we organized the united labor party in Syracuse than the single tax.

The great object for which I declared my intention to support Grover Cleveland has already been secured by bringing the economic question into political discussion. What it is now certain will be discussed this year in every newspaper, on every stump, and wherever throughout the country men talk politics, is the question of taxation as related to wages. Even if Mr. Cleveland is defeated

## CHANCELLOR BIRD'S DECISION.

A New Jersey Lawyer on Some of the Books it Would Prohibit.

The following is from a private letter of an eminent New Jersey lawyer:

I have read the full text of Vice-Chancellor Bird's opinion in the Hutchins case, declaring invalid the bequest for the circulation of Henry George's books.

I do not believe that this doctrine is law in the state of New Jersey. I am satisfied it cannot be. It is completely at variance with that right of free speech, which it was the crowning glory of Erie to have impressed upon the minds of his countrymen, and of Fox to have established as a part of the law by act of parliament. Aside from its conflict with the broad doctrine of law it is, I feel, certainly not sustained by the precedents; but on the contrary, in the face of the doctrine of the decided cases.

Such a doctrine would certainly make a charitable bequest to distribute gratuitously the works of Thomas Jefferson invalid.

You doubtless remember Jefferson's letter to James Madison, in which he says: "I set out on this ground, which I suppose to be self evident, that the earth belongs in usufruct to the living; that the dead have neither powers nor rights over it. The portion occupied by any individual ceases to be his, when himself ceases to be, and reverts to society." He then proceeds to say: "That no man can, by natural right, oblige the land he occupies, or the person who succeeds him in that occupation, to the payment of debts contracted by him. For if he could, he might during his own life eat up the usufruct of lands for several generations to come, and then the lands would belong to the dead and not to the living, which is the reverse of our principle." He then goes on to hold as to national debt, as follows: "The conclusion then is, that neither the representatives of a nation, nor the whole nation itself assembled, can validly engage debts beyond what they may pay within their own time, that is to say, within thirty-four years of the date of the engagement." Mr. Jefferson considered thirty-four years the period, practically, of a generation.

I suppose you also remember the view that Carlyle expresses in "Past and Present," written at the time of the corn law agitation (upon the subject of selling land). It is as follows:

Men talk of "selling" land. Land, it is true, like epic poems and even higher things, in such a trading world, has to be presented in the market for what it will bring, and we say be "sold"; but the word "sell" is a certain death to the land. The land of Homer, now

and more the land of the world creator, is a ridiculous impossibility! We buy what is saleable of it; nothing more was ever buyable. Who can or could sell it to us? Properly speaking, the land belongs to these two—to the Almighty God, and to all his children of men that have ever worked well on it or that shall ever work well on it. No question of men can or could, with never such a leniency and effort, sell land on any other principle. It is not the property of any generation, we say, but that all the past generations that are worked on it, and of all the future ones that shall work on it.

And I suppose you also know of the view expressed by J. H. Ruskin on the subject of private ownership in land. In his criticism of Professor Fawcett's discussion of the subject of rent, in his "Manual of Political Economy," he says, as follows:

These principles the professor goes on contentedly to investigate, never appearing to contemplate for an instant the possibility of the first principle in the whole business—the maintenance by force of the possession of land obtained by force being ever called in question by any human mind. It is, nevertheless, a fact, that in all the land that has ever been taken by original theft, or whether reactionary theft is indeed theft at all, and further, what, excluding either original or corrective theft, are the just conditions of the possession of land.

I do not know of anything that more strongly and graphically pictures the genesis of European war debts than the following paragraph from Ruskin:

Capitalists, when they do not know what to do with their money, persuade the peasants, in various countries, that the said peasants want guns to kill each other with. The peasants accordingly borrow guns, on the manufacture of which the capitalists get a percentage, and men of science much amusement and credit. Then the peasants shoot a certain number of each other, until they get tired; and burn each other's homes down in various places. Then they put the guns back into towers, arsenals, etc., in ornamental patterns (and the victorious party is the same as the same ragged flags in churches). And then the capitalists, and all the rest of the world, want to put a premium on the loss of the guns and guns wider. And that is what capitalists call "knowing what to do with their money," and what commercial men in general call "practical" as opposed to "sentimental" political economy.

Now, it seems to me that one and all of these quotations are within the doctrine of the vice-chancellor's opinion—the Jefferson, the Carlyle and second Ruskin quotations—because they hold up to ridicule the one, the idea of absolute ownership of land, and the other, the obligation of a national debt, and the first Ruskin quotation, that it speaks of ownership of land as "theft." Of course, under the vice-chancellor's doctrine it would be impossible to make the subject of a charitable bequest the distribution of a work condemning capital punishment and advocating the abrogation of the laws now enforcing it. The list of the works that would thus be condemned would certainly be a significant argument to present to the court on review.

A Card and Affidavit from Mr. Michael Clarke.

ANTI-POVERTY SOCIETY: EDWARD MCGLYNN, E.D.; JAMES REDPATH, President; S. T. COOPER, Vice-President; SILVESTER L. LANE, MICHAEL CLARKE, Treasurer.

Room 27, COOPER UNION, 1 NEW YORK, June 12, 1888.

Mr. HENRY GEORGE—Sir: In your note to the letter of Mr. Barnes in THE STANDARD of Saturday last you mention me as authority for the assertion by you in THE STANDARD of June 2 that the nomination of a separate candidate at Cincinnati was against the views of Mr. Barnes. I called at your office yesterday afternoon and assured you that I never had made to anybody any such statement or any remark or suggestion that could be so construed. You replied that I had made the statement to you in the course of our conversation in the smoking car on our journey from Albany a couple of weeks ago.

Herewith I send you a copy of an affidavit I have just made before a notary public, which, as well as this note, I request you to publish in the next issue of THE STANDARD.

MICHAEL CLARKE.

ROOF, 27, COOPER UNION, 1 NEW YORK, June 12, 1888.

Mr. HENRY GEORGE—Sir: In your note to the letter of Mr. Barnes in THE STANDARD of Saturday last you mention me as authority for the assertion by you in THE STANDARD of June 2 that the nomination of a separate candidate at Cincinnati was against the views of Mr. Barnes. I called at your office yesterday afternoon and assured you that I never had made to anybody any such statement or any remark or suggestion that could be so construed. You replied that I had made the statement to you in the course of our conversation in the smoking car on our journey from Albany a couple of weeks ago.

Herewith I send you a copy of an affidavit I have just made before a notary public, which, as well as this note, I request you to publish in the next issue of THE STANDARD.

MICHAEL CLARKE.

ROOF, 27, COOPER UNION, 1 NEW YORK, June 12, 1888.

I, Michael Clarke, hereby declare that I never made to Henry George or to any other person the statement that "the nomination of a separate candidate at Cincinnati was against the views of Gaylord Bennett, or any suggestion or remark the like, so construed or understood." MICHAEL CLARKE.

DANIEL R. GARDNER, (6) Notary Public, N. Y. County.

I have only to say, that on the afternoon of May 25th, while I was returning from the

hearing on the electoral reform bill at Albany, Michael Clarke, who with Dr. McGlynn, Mr. John McMackin and Mr. Peter Gates had seats in another car, came into the smoking car where I was and took a seat beside me. That during the course of a desultory conversation, and without my having said anything to suggest it, Mr. Clarke turned to me, and with the air of a man who wishes voluntarily to correct a misapprehension, said in substance:

You people are much mistaken if you think Barnes runs things at Cincinnati. He was opposed to a separate nomination, and it was Dr. McGlynn who carried it. Barnes wanted us to nominate Streeter even after the other convention had refused to combine with us and had gone home.

I did not consider this of enough importance to ask questions, and do not know whether it is true or false. But I do know that Mr. Michael Clarke's denial is false.

HENRY GEORGE.

Massachusetts Citizens Tired of Being Robbed.

At a recent meeting of the Lynn, Mass., land and labor club the following resolutions were unanimously adopted:

Whereas, the city of Lynn in all probability will soon increase its indebtedness by the erection of a new high school building, and increasing the rate of taxation, which is already too high, and adding to the burden of the wealth producers of the community; and

Whereas, our present system of taxation, being one that rests principally upon the products of labor, is necessarily restrictive in its character, having a tendency to retard the erection of buildings and the use or manufacture of machinery, and consequently an increased tax on lessened fewer houses and lessened fewer workers, which means less opportunity for labor and higher rents.

Resolved, That in the judgment of this club, the city should at once take measures to secure from the Lynn and Boston street railway, the Lynn gas company, the Lynn electric lighting company, and any or all other corporations holding special privileges from the city, the yearly payment to the city of the full rental value of the privileges; and be it further resolved, That the assessors of this city, instead of helping land speculators by low valuations on their lands, should take especial pains to put vacant lots throughout on exactly the same footing, as to valuation, with the improved lots, the city thus deriving a proper and legitimate revenue now absolutely given away.

The Tariff Question in Minnesota.

GEORGETOWN, Clay County, Minn.—The tariff question not only will, but now is, the great question of the day.

Resolved, That the whole nation assembles to demand that the national debt be paid off in gold.

Resolved, That the assessors of this city,

instead of helping land speculators by low valuations on their lands, should take especial

pains to put vacant lots throughout on exactly the same footing, as to valuation,

with the improved lots, the city thus deriving a proper and legitimate revenue now absolutely given away.

By denying men the right to employ themselves on the material so abundantly furnished by nature, we force laborers to bid against each other for permission to work, and in that way to reduce wages, which, in turn, reduces consumption and production, and the strike, the boycott and the tramp are the inevitable results.

The market value of land is an approximate criterion of its relative value in production.

Land of high value by reason of its fertility or situation is superior to cheap land in the same sense that the reaper is superior to the sickle in the production of wheat.

The most casual thought will convince any one that the present land system encourages and causes men to hold valuable land out of use in the hope of a rise in price, and thus drives capital and labor to cheaper land. This, besides its injustice to the dispossessed class, occasions great losses to society as a whole, just as it would to prohibit the use of steam and electricity, and compel the continuance of the freight wagon and pony express. It is as great a detriment to the prosperity of the people of Washington to compel a part of them to live at Tacoma park and waste their time and money riding back and forth past vacant land, as it would be to deny those in the city the uses of horses and street cars, and compel them to waste their time and money riding in sedan chairs.

By the same force that drives clerks and business men to the outlying country, poor people are crowded into stifling tenement houses, and agriculture is banished to the bleak plains of Dakota, and the burning deserts of Arizona. The attempt to bind them together again with railroad and telegraph increases land values, and tends to still further crowd some and unnatural scatter others.

Private monopoly of land stands convicted of causing untold misery and injustice to a large class and of depriving society of the major portion of its best means of subsistence. But this is by no means all. It is a powerful check to the development of productive forces.

The girls' gymnastic club, at the People's Palace, London Echo.

At the People's palace, Mile end, is one little sanctum sanctorum, into which the foot of man, save those of the duly qualified high priests, has never penetrated. It is the gymnasium on a Tuesday or Friday night, when the scores of tired girl workers have come in, have doffed their ordinary garb, and are ready for an hour or two of the liveliest physical recreation. Sir Edward Hay Currie asked me to come and see them at play, and accordingly I went in on an ordinary night, when the show may be taken as typical of the course of physical training which has been adopted.

The girls' gymnastic club, at the People's Palace, numbers some two hundred and fifty members. It is very rarely, however, that it numbers in full force, and there were by no means all present the other night. The gymnasium is a long wooden hall, fifteen feet high, and all the necessary apparatus and fixtures are in it, from the rings to the parallel bars, and the floor is of polished wood, at 750. The age of the members runs from fifteen to twenty-five. Rapidly the hall fills with a merry, laughing crowd of girls—some are swinging, some vaulting, some exercising upon the parallel bars. But this is all internal. As the clock strikes eight Sergeant Burdett, the popular drill instructor of both boys and girls, with military punctuality, calls them to "fall in ranks," and immediately the lines of girlish figures are ranged down the room.

Miss Connor takes her place at the piano, and the sergeant rapidly inspects his troops, while I try to take in the pretty effect. They all wear proper gymnastic dress, mostly of dark blue serge, and consisting of a loose blouse and tunic, to the knees, knickerbockers, dark stockings and white canvas shoes, and of course no stays. But a little touch of feminine individuality appears in each dress. One perhaps wears a pink belt; a third has a few flowers, while the four leaders all wear most beautiful epaulettes, designed and made by one of their number, a young woman engaged as a braid worker all day. The dresses have the effect of making them look rather short, as a body, and I found that they bore out the usual belief as to the low average height of East London. But there were one or two remarkably pretty and well developed figures among them, the slender girl, the long-legged girl, the walk and movements of whom had been for some time under the training was a notable contrast to the round shoulders and shuffling gait of the most recent recruits.

Miss Connor is an exceptional pianist for work of this kind. She dashes into a spirited march, and the girls carrying the long bars, file off in a quick "musical walk." Then they have a long course of exercises among them, the long-legged girl, the slender girl, the walk and movements of whom had been for some time under the training was a notable contrast to the round shoulders and shuffling gait of the most recent recruits.

Then will prosperity reward the industrious and intelligent, instead of the lucky, the greedy and the cruel.

The abolition of those vices consequent on excessive wealth, idleness, poverty and wretchedness, will decimate the ranks of dishonesty and intemperance, and we will have the destruction of that fatal pessimism that attributes all human woes to the laws of nature and pronounces them incurable.

Population will then be limited, only by the capacity of man and nature, and not by the whims of the so-called owners of nature's bounties.

Then will moral and material progress be free to roll onward at an ever accelerating speed, and man will proceed to assume that exalted position for which he is destined.

One of the "leaders," a slight, pretty girl of sixteen, can jump a height of four feet three inches. Every one to whom I spoke thoroughly enjoyed the exercises, and regarded them as a real luxury, making

after the close confinement of dressing making, or military over which the bulk of them are employed during the day. For these girls are not the roughest and dirtiest of the factory hands; they are of a grade above that, and are gentle and well spoken. There is, indeed, some refinement and womanliness about them all. The fact, too, that the "leaders" whose gymnastic merits have carried them up to the position are nice girls of peasant address and right feeling is a salutary check upon anything coarse or vulgar.

An Englishman's Opinion.

JEREMY, PA.—It may interest your readers

to learn the opinion expressed by a friend of mine in England on the principles advocated

## OVER POPULATION.

## Explanation of the Anomaly—The Possibility of Plenty for All.

The following short, concise oration was delivered by Arthur P. Davis of Washington, D. C., at the Columbian university of that city, on Wednesday, June 13:

The principle of population, as expounded by Malthus, is that population tends to increase faster than subsistence. In other words, that in all conditions of society certain checks to population have always been, and must always be, in operation, having over population as their cause. This law may have had limited application to isolated parts of the earth's surface among a few savage tribes, but the general statement is controverted by the obvious fact that neither the whole earth, nor any considerable part of it, has ever been over populated. That all the checks to population enumerated by Malthus and his followers, under the heads of "Moral Restraint," "Vice and Misery," have been at various times, and are now in operation, and that they are sometimes due to actual scarcity of subsistence, is true. But it is equally true that over population has never been the cause.

Many writers assume to controvert the theory of over population by denying the existence of the checks; and by pointing to the fact that nearly all the natural opportunities for production are unused; that light and air are inexhaustible, and that therefore upon population cannot be a check.

These persons ignore the fact that starvation does figure largely in mortality statistics, and that poverty does operate as a strong check to marriage. They seem to be oblivious of the natural opportunities for production are unused; that light and air are inexhaustible, and that therefore upon population cannot be a check.

This report also says that the financial reformers have much reason to be satisfied with the year's work, as many politicians have taken up and discussed the questions which the association has been agitating, and they are attracting the attention of the voters.

The Cause and Cure of "Sweating" in London.

London Star.

There are two nations in London—the nation of the west and the nation of the east—the men and the women who produce and the men and women who enjoy. We do not bind ourselves to all the statements made about sweating. Some of them seem to be inaccurate enough. But there can be no doubt about the main facts and the social and economic principles which underlie them. That there are people who make maudles for six pence which sell for as many guineas is not a fact; but that there are many guineas which are paid for maudles and for maulds by makers, by dint of working from early morn to late night, can only earn 25 d. and 24 d. a gross of b. xes, and that the difference of one farthing is the difference between semi-starvation and a bare subsistence, is also unquestioned. The larger social facts escape us—so terrible are they in their import. Thousands on thousands of our population are daily growing up, badly fed, badly warmed, badly housed, untouched by what we call "the law of the land," and the movement of the age. We don't know what other facts have to say to this. All we can say is that we pride ourselves on the fact that we are the sweatings of a revolution which may destroy our civilization—are manufacturing a kind of moral melancholy which may one day lay London, in its beauty as well as in its squalor, level with the Thames.

Where is the remedy? "Keep out the Poles," say some, "who lower the standard of subsistence and drive our unskilled laborers to the wall." What is quite possible we must do, but it does not get us far. We must do more. We must have a system which will not allow us to be slaves to the sweatings of factories, will cure the sweating business is about as sensible as to say that we pride ourselves on the fact that we are the sweatings of a revolution which may destroy our civilization—are manufacturing a kind of moral melancholy which may one day lay London, in its beauty as well as in its squalor, level with the Thames.

Where is the remedy? "Keep out the Poles," say some, "who lower the standard of subsistence and drive our unskilled laborers to the wall." What is quite possible we must do, but it does not get us far. We must do more. We must have a system which will not allow us to be slaves to the sweatings of factories, will cure the sweating business is about as sensible as to say that we pride ourselves on the fact that we are the sweatings of a revolution which may destroy our civilization—are manufacturing a kind of moral melancholy which may one day lay London, in its beauty as well as in its squalor, level with the Thames.

Where is the remedy? "Keep out the Poles," say some, "who lower the standard of subsistence and drive our unskilled laborers to the wall." What is quite possible we must do, but it does not get us far. We must do more. We must have a system which will not allow us to be slaves to the sweatings of factories, will cure the sweating business is about as sensible as to say that we pride ourselves on the fact that we are the sweatings of a revolution which may destroy our civilization—are manufacturing a kind of moral melancholy which may one day lay London, in its beauty as well as in its squalor, level with the Thames.

Where is the remedy? "Keep out the Poles," say some, "who lower the standard of subsistence and drive our unskilled laborers to the wall." What is quite possible we must do, but it does not get us far. We must do more. We must have a system which will not allow us to be slaves to the sweatings of factories, will cure the sweating business is about as sensible as to say that we pride ourselves on the fact that we are the sweatings of a revolution which may destroy our civilization—are manufacturing a kind of moral melancholy which may one day lay London, in its beauty as well as in its squalor, level with the Thames.

Where is the remedy? "Keep out the Poles," say some, "who lower the standard of subsistence and drive our unskilled laborers to the wall." What is quite possible we must do, but it does not get us far.

## QUERIES AND ANSWERS.

## Hard Times and Machinery.

PHILADELPHIA, Pa.—As the consideration of "hard times" interests the laborer, mechanic, merchant, manufacturer, and capitalist, I wish to give you a few thoughts upon the subject.

The question is often asked, "What is the cause of our dull times?" This has various answers. One says "it is the result of the contraction of the currency." This cannot be, since all industries suffer from dull times when there has been neither expansion nor contraction of the currency, in England, France, and Germany, in fact, all over the civilized world; besides there is more money now in the country per capita than there was during these times. Another answer is, "we are too extravagant, we must economize." A long editorial was published in one of our city dailies a few weeks ago urging upon its readers the duty of every one to economize. Will this bear analyzing?

Suppose we have been in the habit of wearing two silk hats and one Panama each year, and now we have concluded to economize and wear one of a cheaper kind; you see at once we hurt the hat trade. Suppose instead of buying two pairs of boots one year we make one pair do us two years, and, again, we make one suit of clothes last as long as three did in good times. Do we not injure the shoe and clothing manufacturers and dealers? Economy if persistently practised would break up half the merchants of the country. If we would economize we must stop buying books, music, paintings, and every thing that makes our homes beautiful, we must sell our pianos and carriages, and then we hurt the dealers in all of these luxuries. No, the demand is not for greater economy; it would bankrupt the country.

In my opinion we are using too much "labor saving machinery." We make a combination of wood and iron—and that is what a machine is—do the work of brain and muscle. Brain and muscle must suffer. It is all very nice to grow eloquent over the wonderful achievements of the human intellect; to enlarge on the splendid mechanical inventions of man; but what is the result? That man is out of work; he is a tramp. Not the dogs, but the machines, are after him. He is driven from one occupation to another by the little machines. Perhaps when he was a young man he spent the necessary number of years to learn shoe making. After a while along comes a genius, a fellow who lives by his wits, who has invented a machine that will make as many shoes in one hour as he can make in a week—well, what can Mr. Shoemaker do? He has to learn some other trade; perhaps cabinet making; he masters that after a few years (as it does not take a Yankee long to learn a trade); so he goes to work at cabinet making; soon another genius comes along and sells the boss a machine that will do his work many times cheaper. Mr. Cabinet Maker is discharged, and the machine takes his place. He would not permit a Chinaman to do this without a protest, but being a machine, it is all right; he packs up his "kit" and goes. He is driven from one city of refuge to another, and finally takes the road and becomes a tramp.

If 200,000 Chinamen were to land here tomorrow and were to go to work for fifty cents a day, how long do you suppose it would take to raise an army of laborers, mechanics, and merchants, too, sufficient to drive the Chinamen into the river? Now, we allow these machines to work every day for less than fifty cents and we never open our mouths about it. Again, Chinamen would consume something. Society would make them dress and nature would make them eat; machines do neither. They never buy a hat, coat or pair of boots, never want meat, potatoes or anything else that man must have, and yet one machine often does the work of twenty and perhaps fifty men.

Now, if we could discard enough machinery to absorb the surplus labor we could give the mechanic a chance for his life. If the argument that to cheapen the things we must have to administer to our wants is a blessing, then the Chinaman must be a blessing. They will work for twenty-five cents a day and they are almost as handy as a mechanic. If we had plenty of Chinamen laborers employed the mercantile trade would be good, and as the manufacturer depends upon the merchant, of course his business would be good also.

It benefits no one to be able to manufacture goods cheaply. We are all in the same boat. If I am a manufacturer of shoes and can get my shoes made cheaper than any one else, of course I have an advantage, but that is not the case. If I can get my shoes made for six cents a pair it does me no good; other manufacturers can do the same. I have no market for them after they are made. I had better pay twenty-five cents or even a dollar a pair, make fewer and find a market for all I can make and at a profit.

We must have our railroads, steamboat, and other improvements of a kindred nature. They are not labor saving to a great extent, except they save the labor of horses, and men will not raise horses unless it pays. But men do have families and they must have something to do, for the flat is for: "In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread." We can't get around it. We have been trying and our country is in a sorry state—not only our country, but all other civilized countries are in the same condition. In the hope of solving this problem, many say "we must open new markets." Our merchants and manufacturers are considerably exercised about the Brazilian trade. What would the Brazilians be likely to buy of us? For about fifty miles back from the coast, they will want some jewelry and a few crucifixes; in the interior, a shot gun and a jugs of whisky. These are the luxuries and necessities desired by North American Indians. Others say, we must ship our goods to England, France and Germany. If we do that, will we not injure our brother laborers there? We wouldn't like them to treat us in that way, and the golden rule, "All things whatsoever ye would that men should do unto you do ye even so unto them," like the other, must be obeyed.

The prosperity of this nation does not depend upon the millions, because they are in the minority, but upon the millions, and the millions are idle; men and women buy when they have money; they have no money because they have no work. They have no work because all over the land we hear the rattle of machinery. The skillful combinations of iron and wood are doing their work for them. Do they eat and drink, or dress? They consume no bread, but their rattle drowns the cry of hungry children, the rush of shuttles stifles the wail of their shivering mother, and the thud of their hearts of steam is louder than the complaints of afflicted humanity.

There must be a revolution. I hope it may be a peaceful one, but if we persist in the use of "labor saving machinery" as we have for the last twenty-five years the whirlwind must come, and "woe unto him by whom the darkness cometh."

W. C. STRICKLER.

If you are not a protectionist, you have all the symptoms, except figures.

Your reference to the interests of the "laborer, merchant, mechanic manufacturer and capitalist" is paralleled by the advertisement of the quack doctor who cured "sickness, consumption, smallpox, measles and disease." Are not mer-

chants, mechanics and manufacturers laborers? And how many merchants or manufacturers do you know who are not capitalists? Before attempting an inquiry into the causes of "hard times," it would be well for you to get a rational idea of the factors and the distinguishing characteristics of the factors, the relations of which you must consider.

You are quite right in questioning the miser theory of hard times. Hard times are not to be cured by economizing. If one man economizes when others do not, he may relieve his hard times; but when all economize, all must experience harder and harder times. Last summer a young man, while traveling in the interior of this state, fell into discussion with a commercial traveler on the subject of abolishing poverty.

"Well," said the commercial traveler, "I believe that the way to abolish poverty is to save—to be economical; the more economical men are the more certainly will poverty be abolished."

"You are a drummer, are you not?" inquired the young man.

"Yes," said the commercial traveler, "I am a drummer for a dry goods house."

"Well now," the young man again inquired, "if everybody should be as economical as possible, how long would you be on the road?"

The commercial traveler hesitated, combed his hair with his fingers, stared at the floor, and with a "give-it-up" grin responded: "Sure enough! I wouldn't be on the road a week."

The economical doctrine had lost an advocate.

Of course economy is not a remedy for hard times. Trading is essential, to prosperity, and the more active the trading the greater the prosperity. If men did not buy they could not sell. That is the reason that protection is a bad thing. It forces people to economize more than they want to. The farmer buys one hat when he wants two, or a poor hat when he wants a good one; and that helps to make hard times for haters. Hatters in their turn suffering from hard times buy a pound of flour when they want two; and that makes hard times for the farmer. And so it goes, until every one complains of hard times, and denies himself to relieve them, when what is really needed is that every one shall be free to buy whatever he wants in exchange for whatever he can make.

But after giving your common sense full swing in showing the absurdity of this theory, you fall a victim to the fallacy of fallacies that underlies the doctrine of protection. We make a machine do the work of brain and muscle, you say, and therefore brain and muscle must suffer.

How could you write such stuff and not see its absurdity. You might as well have said that electricity carries our messages, and therefore our legs must suffer. If brain and muscle suffer because their drudgery is done by machinery, brain might find relief in libraries and in ball matches. We are not compelled to do without exercise because machines work for us. You may ride in a drawing room car to Albany, but if your legs are shriveled for want of exercise there is nothing to prevent your walking to Albany. What you have in mind when you say that brain and muscle must suffer because machinery does their work, is that a great many people are able to live only as a few others give them opportunity to work for a living, and that these few give less work to men when machines will do the same work cheaper. There is a truth in this, the pith of which you ignore. The evil is not in machinery which relieves us of labor, but in the use of machinery under a system that makes some men dependent upon others for the right to work, and the true remedy is not to restrict the use of machinery, but to remove restrictions from opportunities to work.

That the tramp is a result of the introduction of machinery is true; but machinery is only a secondary and innocent cause. So long as any man wants anything which labor can produce, there is work to do; and so long as standing room on the earth remains there is natural opportunity for work. If, therefore, machinery causes idleness, it is not because it does all the work that is needed, but all that the forestallers of mother earth will permit.

You are wrong in supposing that men cannot readily shift from one employment to another. Between one extreme and another of diversified employment there is, indeed, a gulf which few workmen can cross and which none can cross without great effort and expenditure of time; but between one employment and a great number of employments nearly related to it, there is so little difference that any intelligent man can readily adapt himself to a change. Hence, to introduce machinery into any of these employments, even though the machine does all the work, is not naturally to deprive workmen in that employment of work; it is to invite them into other fields of industry to which they are quite as well adapted, and where in consequence of the machinery that has relieved them of the work they once did, they can get with less labor more of the comforts of life than they got before. This is the natural result. But since greater power of production consequent on the introduction of machinery makes greater demands for land which is privately owned, the value of land rises, so that on the one hand the machine does not produce as cheaply as it otherwise would, and on the other the workman finds it more difficult to get access to land, without which he cannot work at all. Machinery is to a mechanic what a vacation is to the man who works by the day; in itself desirable, but dreaded because it closes the only source of income open to him.

A machine that will make as many shoes in an hour as a shoemaker can make in a week should be a good thing for the shoemaker, just as a washing machine is a good thing for the farmer's wife; the reason it is not because when the shoemaker turns to the vast fields of employment that invite his labor, he finds the fields fenced off into narrow lanes with a toll gate at the head of each lane and a toll gate at the end of each lane and a new and higher schedule of tolls at every toll. Land rose rapidly in price; and the more it rose the greater was the number and enthusiasm of the speculators. This brought about the crash of 1837. But notwithstanding that disaster, the government still had a large surplus; and congress forced it among the people by distributing it among the states, most of which wasted it, scattering it either in loans upon land or in digging canals which never paid for a quarter of their cost. The result of this was a revival of speculation in 1838 and 1839, ending with

think them, why discard only enough to absorb surplus labor? If surplus labor were absorbed merely, that would only keep wages where they were for a time; increase of population would soon make a new surplus of labor. Why not discard all machinery at once and prohibit its introduction again?

You are mistaken in saying that it benefits no one to manufacture goods cheaply. It benefits every one. You are thinking of money when you speak of cheapness. Cheapness in money really makes no difference in the long run to any one; but when all economize, all must experience harder and harder times. Last summer a young man, while traveling in the interior of this state, fell into discussion with a commercial traveler on the subject of abolishing poverty.

"Well," said the commercial traveler,

"I believe that the way to abolish poverty is to save—to be economical; the more economical men are the more certainly will poverty be abolished."

"You are a drummer, are you not?" inquired the young man.

"Yes," said the commercial traveler, "I am a drummer for a dry goods house."

"Well now," the young man again inquired, "if everybody should be as economical as possible, how long would you be on the road?"

The commercial traveler hesitated, combed his hair with his fingers, stared at the floor, and with a "give-it-up" grin responded: "Sure enough! I wouldn't be on the road a week."

The economical doctrine had lost an advocate.

Of course economy is not a remedy for hard times. Trading is essential, to prosperity, and the more active the trading the greater the prosperity. If men did not buy they could not sell. That is the reason that protection is a bad thing. It forces people to economize more than they want to. The farmer buys one hat when he wants two, or a poor hat when he wants a good one; and that helps to make hard times for haters. Hatters in their turn suffering from hard times buy a pound of flour when they want two; and that makes hard times for the farmer. And so it goes, until every one complains of hard times, and denies himself to relieve them, when what is really needed is that every one shall be free to buy whatever he wants in exchange for whatever he can make.

But after giving your common sense full swing in showing the absurdity of this theory, you fall a victim to the fallacy of fallacies that underlies the doctrine of protection.

We make a machine do the work of brain and muscle, you say, and therefore brain and muscle must suffer. How could you write such stuff and not see its absurdity. You might as well have said that electricity carries our messages, and therefore our legs must suffer. If brain and muscle suffer because their drudgery is done by machinery, brain might find relief in libraries and in ball matches. We are not compelled to do without exercise because machines work for us. You may ride in a drawing room car to Albany, but if your legs are shriveled for want of exercise there is nothing to prevent your walking to Albany. What you have in mind when you say that brain and muscle must suffer because machinery does their work, is that a great many people are able to live only as a few others give them opportunity to work for a living, and that these few give less work to men when machines will do the same work cheaper. There is a truth in this, the pith of which you ignore. The evil is not in machinery which relieves us of labor, but in the use of machinery under a system that makes some men dependent upon others for the right to work, and the true remedy is not to restrict the use of machinery, but to remove restrictions from opportunities to work.

That the tramp is a result of the introduction of machinery is true; but machinery is only a secondary and innocent cause.

So long as any man wants anything which labor can produce, there is work to do; and so long as standing room on the earth remains there is natural opportunity for work. If, therefore, machinery causes idleness, it is not because it does all the work that is needed, but all that the forestallers of mother earth will permit.

You are wrong in supposing that men cannot readily shift from one employment to another. Between one extreme and another of diversified employment there is, indeed, a gulf which few workmen can cross and which none can cross without great effort and expenditure of time; but between one employment and a great number of employments nearly related to it, there is so little difference that any intelligent man can readily adapt himself to a change. Hence, to introduce machinery into any of these employments, even though the machine does all the work, is to invite them into other fields of industry to which they are quite as well adapted, and where in consequence of the machinery that has relieved them of the work they once did, they can get with less labor more of the comforts of life than they got before. This is the natural result. But since greater power of production consequent on the introduction of machinery makes greater demands for land which is privately owned, the value of land rises, so that on the one hand the machine does not produce as cheaply as it otherwise would, and on the other the workman finds it more difficult to get access to land, without which he cannot work at all. Machinery is to a mechanic what a vacation is to the man who works by the day; in itself desirable, but dreaded because it closes the only source of income open to him.

A machine that will make as many shoes in an hour as a shoemaker can make in a week should be a good thing for the shoemaker, just as a washing machine is a good thing for the farmer's wife; the reason it is not because when the shoemaker turns to the vast fields of employment that invite his labor, he finds the fields fenced off into narrow lanes with a toll gate at the head of each lane and a toll gate at the end of each lane and a new and higher schedule of tolls at every toll.

Land rose rapidly in price; and the more it rose the greater was the number and enthusiasm of the speculators. This brought about the crash of 1837. But notwithstanding that disaster, the government still had a large surplus; and congress forced it among the people by distributing it among the states, most of which wasted it, scattering it either in loans upon land or in digging canals which never paid for a quarter of their cost. The result of this was a revival of speculation in 1838 and 1839, ending with

another crash in December, 1839. Both of these panics were directly traceable to the treasury surplus.

So, at the present time, the enormous treasury surplus must either be locked up in government vaults or be loaned out to the banks. Some time ago it was locked up; and then we were driven to the verge of a financial crash, because it was evident that within a few weeks the government would lock up nearly all the floating gold of the country, unless its policy was changed. Accordingly, financiers implored the government to save them from ruin; and in order to do this, the government deposited its surplus freely with the banks, requiring them, however, to repay it on call. The banks have therefore many millions of government money, which, since they must repay it on call, they can only lend on call. But loans on call are invariably made to speculators, as no one else will borrow money in that way. The consequence is that the treasury surplus is now lent out to speculators in order to enable them to keep up prices. The result of this process must inevitably be further speculation, ending in a crash the losses of which the common people must pay. If the surplus were not thus lent to speculators, it would have to be locked up; and then, the country being deprived of its floating gold, not merely all speculation, but all enterprise, would feel the effect as one of strangulation, and the crash would come at once. Meanwhile, any one who reads the daily papers, especially the western papers, can see that a wild land speculation has been going on in the west; and this happens now, as it happened in 1836, 1837 and 1838, simultaneously with the piling up of a surplus in the treasury.

In 1837 the government locked up its surplus and only let out that which it spent in the gradual increase of extravagance. But never, save from mortal lips, has yet gone forth the flat, "in the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread." Yet it is under this human gospel of plunder, and not the decree you quote, that we are living. The man who sets out to obey the command of his maker to eat bread in the sweat of his face finds all the avenues to work which his maker provided, closed by force of human law. If he would eat bread in the sweat of his face he must agree to share it with a leper, not only before eating it, but before he will be permitted to make it. And naturally enough, when the leper discovers a machine that will make bread without sweating or eating, he has no use for the man who is willing to sweat provided he may eat.

Mr. Shearman's Speech.

BOSTON.—(1) Is the Standard oil monopoly due to the tariff?

(2) In Thomas Shearman's article in THE STANDARD of the 19th on the tariff, it is stated that the surplus in the treasury induced excessive speculation in land which brought about the panic of 1837. In what manner does a surplus in the treasury operate to do this?

(3) In another part of the same article he states that the average production of each English workman in the metal and textile industries for the year 1850 was \$789, and that of the American workman in the same industries was \$1,684. Were these values English or American? Ought they not to have been calculated either in American or English values to make a fair comparison, as the same amount of production in England would have a great deal higher value in the United States owing to the tariff?

(1) The Standard oil monopoly is due mainly to private control and manipulation of transportation facilities—to interference with freedom of trade. Public highways are essential to trade, and if they are obstructed in the interest of individuals or corporations, monopolies result. In a similar way, when free intercourse between nations is obstructed by the surplus in the treasury at that time. The panic of 1837 was brought about by the surplus in the treasury at that time. The panic of 1857 was also brought about by speculation in land; but the treasury surplus was not by any means so important an element at that time as it was in 1837. In 1857 the last of the United States debts was paid off, and, in consequence of the maintenance of an exorbitant tariff, a surplus which was greater relatively for that period in our national history than the present surplus rapidly accumulated. This money was distributed by the government among the states, with urgent directions to lend it out freely and make money easy and business active. But as our natural development of industry was checked by the obstruction of the tariff, and as this money was forced out of natural channels for work, it is very clear that they gain no advantage by getting only 40 per cent higher wages than the Englishman. But even if we were to allow for the utmost difference in price which any one will claim, this will not be more than 40 per cent, and therefore, adding 40 per cent to the price of the English product would bring it up to \$1,692 against the American workman's \$1,684. This shows that the production of American workmen averages more than 50 per cent in excess of the production of English workmen, quite irrespective of the price; that is to say, for each yard of cloth or ton of metal which the English workman produces to the American workman's product the American workman makes an enormous profit of the American workman's product. But if it is not true, still this is the only fair basis of comparison; because the same Americans who produce metals and textiles have to use them; and if the articles which they have to buy cost them 120 per cent more than the same goods cost the English workman, it is very clear that they gain no advantage by getting only 40 per cent higher wages than the Englishman. But even if we were to allow for the utmost difference in price which any one will claim, this will not be more than 40 per cent, and therefore, adding 40 per cent to the price of the English product would bring it up to \$1,692 against the American workman's \$1,684. This shows that the production of American workmen averages more than 50 per cent in excess of the production of English workmen, quite irrespective of the price; that is to say, for each yard of cloth or ton of metal which the English workman produces to the American workman, it is very clear that they gain no advantage by getting only 40 per cent higher wages than the Englishman. But even if we were to allow for the utmost difference in price which any one will claim, this will not be more than 40 per cent, and therefore, adding 40 per cent to the price of the English product would bring it up to \$1,692 against the American workman's \$1,684. This shows that the production of American workmen averages more than 50 per cent in excess of the production of English workmen, quite irrespective of the price; that is to say, for each yard of cloth or ton of metal which the English workman produces to the American workman, it is very clear that they gain no advantage by getting only 40 per cent higher wages than the Englishman. But even if we were to allow for the utmost difference in price which any one will claim, this will not be more than 40 per cent, and therefore, adding 40 per cent to the price of the English product would bring it up to \$1,692 against the American workman's \$1

## THE STANDARD.

HENRY GEORGE, Editor and Proprietor.

Published weekly at

15 UNION SQUARE, NEW YORK CITY.

TERMS, POSTAGE FREE.

One year, \$2.50; six months, \$1.25; single copies, 5 cents.  
Mailed at the post office, New York, as second class matter.

Communications and contributions are invited, and will be attentively considered. Manuscripts not found suitable for publication will be returned if sufficient postage is sent for return postage. No notice will be taken of anonymous communications.

Communications and letters on editorial matters should be addressed to the EDITOR OF THE STANDARD, and all communications on business to the PUBLISHER OF THE STANDARD.

THE STANDARD wants an agent to secure subscribers at every post office in the United States, to whom special terms will be given.

THE STANDARD is for sale by newsmen through the United States. Persons who may be unable to obtain it will confer a favor on the publisher by notifying him promptly.

Sample copies sent free on application.

SATURDAY, JUNE 16, 1888.

THE STANDARD is forwarded to subscribers by the early morning mails each Thursday. Subscribers who do not receive the paper promptly will confer a favor by communicating with the publisher.

## THE LAW OF LABOR STRIKES.

There is now pending before the court of appeals of this state and soon to be decided, a case which will settle the law of labor strikes. It is a habeas corpus proceeding in behalf of John E. Gill against Police Justice Smith and Warden Walsh.

In September, 1886, Gardner & Estes, a shoe manufacturing firm, employed a new foreman—one Hart. Hart, it appears, had the reputation in the trade of a "scab" foreman, that is, a foreman who is expert in breaking up shop organizations. As Gardner & Estes' shop was a union shop, considerable anxiety was felt by the employees over the employment of Hart, and they remonstrated with the firm. The head of the firm assured them of his good intentions, and begged them to give Hart a fair trial. At the firm's request the employees laid the question of Hart's employment on the table for a month, to see whether or not he would try to interfere with the organization, and at the end of that time, the foreman having done nothing inimical to the organization, the matter was laid over two months longer.

Before the expiration of the latter period, and in the absence of the firm, Hart discharged one of the most active union men in the shop, one who had been employed there for four years, and was recognized as an excellent workman. When asked why he had discharged this man, Hart replied that it was because he had detected him in stealing. The employees then demanded of Hart that he either reinstate the discharged workman or prosecute him for stealing. The workman was reinstated.

A few weeks later, on the return of Mr. Gardner, the same man was again discharged on the same accusation. The employees sent a committee to Mr. Gardner to know the reason, and on receiving his reply, proposed an arbitration between a committee of the Knights of Labor and a committee of the employers' union. To this Mr. Gardner acceded.

Before the Knights of Labor committee, of which Mr. Gill was chairman, arrived, Hart, the foreman, discharged every one in the shop; and when the committee came they were informed by the employees of this "lockout" and instructed that under no circumstances would the employees now return to work unless Hart was discharged.

At the meeting between the Knights of Labor committee and the employer's committee Mr. Gill and his associates stated as a condition of settlement that the foreman must be discharged, and when asked whether in case of his discharge the foreman could get work elsewhere, replied that no union man within fifty miles of New York could work with him on pain of expulsion. Accordingly Hart was discharged and Gardner & Estes took back their former employees.

Thereupon Hart preferred a complaint against Mr. Gill and the other members of the committee and they were arrested. Police Justice Smith held them, after a hearing, on the charge of conspiring to injure trade, and by means of threats and intimidation to prevent Hart from working. On habeas corpus proceedings before Judge Barrett the police magistrate was sustained, Judge Barrett writing an opinion, in which he held that such combinations of workmen were criminal.

On appeal to the general term of the supreme court Judge Barrett's decision was affirmed, and from the general term the case has now gone to the court of appeals.

This is the first time that the question of labor strikes has come before our highest court. In 1812 it was held in the mayor's court of this city that a combination of workmen to refuse to work with men who worked for less than schedule wages were indictable; a similar decision was rendered in the general sessions in 1825; and in 1835 the old supreme court decided to the same effect. These are the only cases of the kind in this state, except very recent ones, none of which have been appealed.

In the present case all elements of violence and of any form of coercion except the negative form involved in an agreement not to work are eliminated, and the court of appeals must broadly determine whether that form of coercion is unlawful. If it decides that it is, labor strikes will be outlawed. It is true that the penal code expressly permits peaceful strikes to raise or maintain wages; but this permission, should the court of appeals decide against Gill, will insure only to the benefit

of strikes having that object directly in view. Thus, if a shoe manufacturer reduces or refuses to raise the wages of his employees, they may strike; but if the employees in other shops or in other trades strike to assist them, the latter strikers may be indicted. So, if an employer refuses to employ or discharge union men, and his men strike on that account, they may be indicted. It will be readily seen, therefore, that the decision of this case involves substantially the lawfulness of all labor strikes.

The case is one of the most important that has ever come before the court of appeals, and the decision will be awaited with interest. Should it be adverse to Gill, trades unions in this state will find themselves almost powerless until the legislature modifies the present statute.

## THE TARIFF DEBATE.

The five minutes debate begins to drag, owing to the fact that the dilatory tactics of the republicans cause much irrelevant discussion. It took two more days to dispose of the paragraph putting lumber on the free list, and the debate took a wide range. During its continuance the democrats pinned several of the republican members down to the admission that protection did not secure any higher wages to men engaged in the lumber industries than are paid to men in the same region engaged in unprotected industries. Mr. Anderson, a republican from Iowa, took strong ground in favor of free lumber, and declared his purpose to support the Mills bill, since the republicans had failed to bring in any bill reducing the revenue, as they were bound to do by their platform.

One of the amusing incidents of the discussion was the persistence of Mr. Funston (republican) of Kansas in avoiding a direct answer to the question whether or not he was in favor of maintaining a duty on lumber. The republican legislature of Kansas has requested the members of the house from that state to vote for free lumber, and Mr. Funston's colleagues have in consequence voted with the democrats on that clause in the pending bill. Mr. Funston, however, managed in the course of a speech to declare that he was in favor of protecting every industry carried on in this country, and that he would therefore vote against putting lumber on the free list.

Belgium has her native government; her brave and chivalrous militia; her glorious universities; her manufacturing districts teeming with population; her well fed, comfortable, intelligent peasantry; her granaries fairly bursting with the weight and wealth of agriculture.

Ireland, on the other hand, sits weeping in the widowhood of provincialism, the eternal shame of England. Her patient peasants labor on her fertile soil and reap the grain and tend the flocks, garnering and shearing for the stranger, and crawling into their cabins to live in a condition of permanent want.

And the reason of it all, according to the Press, is that Ireland is cursed with British free trade, while Belgium sits under the vine and fig tree of protection. Evidently the Press writer has never been to Belgium, and doesn't know that next to England Belgium comes nearer to free trade than any country in Europe. But let that pass. There is one distinctive feature about the Belgian political system that the Press ignores. Out of 6,000,000 of inhabitants, only 117,000 have votes. According to the *post hoc ergo propter hoc* style of argument of the Press, the example of Belgium teaches that the way to secure the prosperity of a nation is to disfranchise its people.

The New York *Economist* seems to be very much muddled about the question of free wool, no unusual thing by the way for an economist of the protection persuasion. With a horrified air it warns the country that "the city is full of foreign wool dealers to-day watching the operations of congress and the passage of the Mills bill, and in such an event they are prepared to fill all orders and supply the American mills with a twelve months' stock at ten cents a pound less on unwashed wools, twenty cents on washed, and thirty cents on scoured wools, and fifty cents a pound on worsted combed tops." This is supposed to be disheartening news. But why, it is difficult to see. If American mills can get their raw material so much cheaper, they can and must sell their products cheaper; selling cheaper they will sell more; selling more they will need more workmen; and needing more workmen they will promote a tendency to higher wages. There is no necessity for shedding bitter tears over such a state of affairs.

The *Economist* appears to have suspected that its cheap foreign wool scare was not exactly adapted to the labor department of the protection school of political economy; so it treats one Mr. E. S. Higgins as a man who "stands ready to close the largest mill in America the remainder of the year if wool is admitted free." Mr. Higgins must contemplate an engagement with Barnum, as a mercantile "freak," if he seriously proposes to close his mill because he can get cheaper raw material. It would be intensely painful to have Mr. Higgins carry out his threat, but if he really "won't play," somebody else will, and we take pleasure in assuring these "foreign wool dealers" who are "watching the operations of congress and the passage of the Mills bill," that the American wool market will not close when Mr. Higgins takes his vacation.

## LIMITATION OF FORTUNES.

The Boston *Globe* sensibly says in discussing overgrown fortunes and propositions to arbitrarily limit them by law, that "when our laws are made to say that a man cannot make just as much money as he possibly can, provided he makes it honestly," and "when affairs have come to such a crisis that the government takes the liberty of inspecting a private citizen's account books and reducing his business within certain prescribed limits, then democracy will have passed beyond the experimental era and will have demonstrated

that itself a flat failure." To all of which THE STANDARD says, "Amen!"

But it must not be forgotten that there is, or at least ought to be, vast significance in that adverb "honestly." A man should be allowed "to make just as much money as he possibly can, provided he can make it *honestly*." If that means anything, it means that laws must not be made—if made, must not be permitted to stand—which enable any one to make money by getting what other people earn.

When protective tariffs compete consumers to pay more for what they use than it is worth in open market, the beneficiaries of such tariffs do not make their money honestly. When railway franchises enable their owners to charge producers "all the traffic will bear" for transporting products, the beneficiaries of those franchises do not make their money honestly. When slave laws protect masters in appropriating the earnings of their slaves, the masters do not make their money honestly. When land laws force wages down by putting premiums on the natural opportunities of labor, the beneficiaries of cheapened labor do not make their money honestly. When landlords grow rich by taking part of the produce of labor as a price for permitting labor to be done, the landlords do not make their money honestly.

This is no indictment of individuals; it is an indictment of laws. Individuals who profit by such laws are simply doing what society invites them to do, and society has no right to complain. But such laws should be abolished, and every man left to make, in the language of the *Globe*, "just as much money as he possibly can, provided he makes it *honestly*."

The Press institutes a comparison between Belgium and Ireland, and therefrom deduces a moral. Belgium, it tells us, "is a shining example of national and industrial independence," while Ireland is "the Cinderella of the nations." Belgium has her native government; her brave and chivalrous militia; her glorious universities; her manufacturing districts teeming with population; her well fed, comfortable, intelligent peasantry; her granaries fairly bursting with the weight and wealth of agriculture.

Ireland, on the other hand, sits weeping in the widowhood of provincialism, the eternal shame of England. Her patient peasants labor on her fertile soil and reap the grain and tend the flocks, garnering and shearing for the stranger, and crawling into their cabins to live in a condition of permanent want.

And the reason of it all, according to the Press, is that Ireland is cursed with British free trade, while Belgium sits under the vine and fig tree of protection.

Evidently the Press writer has never been to Belgium, and doesn't know that next to England Belgium comes nearer to free trade than any country in Europe. But let that pass. There is one distinctive feature about the Belgian political system that the Press ignores. Out of 6,000,000 of inhabitants, only 117,000 have votes. According to the *post hoc ergo propter hoc* style of argument of the Press, the example of Belgium teaches that the way to secure the prosperity of a nation is to disfranchise its people.

The New York *Economist* seems to be very much muddled about the question of free wool, no unusual thing by the way for an economist of the protection persuasion. With a horrified air it warns the country that "the city is full of foreign wool dealers to-day watching the operations of congress and the passage of the Mills bill, and in such an event they are prepared to fill all orders and supply the American mills with a twelve months' stock at ten cents a pound less on unwashed wools, twenty cents on washed, and thirty cents on scoured wools, and fifty cents a pound on worsted combed tops." This is supposed to be disheartening news. But why, it is difficult to see.

If American mills can get their raw material so much cheaper, they can and must sell their products cheaper; selling cheaper they will sell more; selling more they will need more workmen; and needing more workmen they will promote a tendency to higher wages. There is no necessity for shedding bitter tears over such a state of affairs.

The *Economist* appears to have suspected that its cheap foreign wool scare was not exactly adapted to the labor department of the protection school of political economy; so it treats one Mr. E. S. Higgins as a man who "stands ready to close the largest mill in America the remainder of the year if wool is admitted free." Mr. Higgins must contemplate an engagement with Barnum, as a mercantile "freak," if he seriously proposes to close his mill because he can get cheaper raw material. It would be intensely painful to have Mr. Higgins carry out his threat, but if he really "won't play," somebody else will, and we take pleasure in assuring these "foreign wool dealers" who are "watching the operations of congress and the passage of the Mills bill," that the American wool market will not close when Mr. Higgins takes his vacation.

## LIMITATION OF FORTUNES.

The Boston *Globe* sensibly says in discussing overgrown fortunes and propositions to arbitrarily limit them by law, that "when our laws are made to say that a man cannot make just as much money as he possibly can, provided he makes it honestly," and "when affairs have come to such a crisis that the government takes the liberty of inspecting a private citizen's account books and reducing his business within certain prescribed limits, then democracy will have passed beyond the experimental era and will have demonstrated

that cheap? And what is Mr. Higgins waiting for? Why does he merely stand "ready to close the largest mill in America the remainder of the year if wool is admitted free?" Why does he not close it now, since "we have free wool?" Barnum's season has already begun; he need not wait on that account.

This is a sample of the kind of argument that is served by protection advocates. In one brief paragraph we are asked to infer that cheap raw material will prevent its use in manufacturing; told that the largest manufacturer will close his mill if his raw material is made free of duty, and reminded that that very raw material is already free and has been for two years. Mark Twain used to tell of a unique character who made himself invincible in argument by the simple process of inventing his facts. Twain's character must have been the original protectionist.

Speaking of the democratic platform, the Press says: "We now have a free trade platform. If the people want free trade they will elect Cleveland and Thurman next November. If not, they will elect the republican candidates." This is not exactly true. We are sorry to say that the platform is not a free trade platform. It is an anti protective platform, and that is about as near to free trade as can be expected of a political platform in these early days of the great struggle upon which we are entering. It is a step, and a long and decisive one, in the direction of free trade. If that is what our *Su-a*-eclipsing contemporary means there is no reason to find fault with its statement. The platform is in truth a challenge to the republicans to fight the protection issue; and any democrat who pretends to be a protectionist might as well pack up his traps and go over to his friends now as later in the contest. The latter part of the Press's observation is quite true. If the people—that is, a majority of the people—want free trade they will elect Cleveland and Thurman, and if not they will elect the republican candidates; and whether the democratic or the republican ticket be elected, this is certain, that the popular vote for Cleveland and Thurman will be the free trade vote of the country.

Investigated still further and found that one fruit stall man on Broadway, near Pine street, pays an annual rental equal to \$600. Another, near Sixth and Olive streets, pays \$25 a month for his privilege. He showed the receipt for his last payment. It was signed by a well known firm of real estate dealers. The last mentioned stall is on one of the busiest corners in St. Louis, and where the travel is the thickest and the sidewalk the narrowest. Figuring at a rough guess, there are a thousand of these sidewalk selling places; and a policeman told me that that number was not too large; and placing the annual rent of each at \$50, we have \$50,000 a year that goes into the pockets of private persons for the use of public ground.

Ye, verily, it is hard to impose on the great American public!

As I stood thinking of this, I said to a police officer: "It's a shame, isn't it?"

"Oh, I don't know," he replied, "it don't affect me."

"It doesn't? Why, all you have been asking for is \$50,000 to give the needed increase in the police force. How about this \$50,000 that is going to waste?"

And then he scratched his head and admitted it seriously affected him.

CITIZEN.

## A Card from Father Huntington.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE STANDARD.—Your editorial article last week assumes that the Rev. Dr. De Costa is expressing the opinion of "an association imposed largely of clergymen" in his manifesto aent the Charity organization society. Will you allow me to state that I do not know of any other member of the church association for the advancement of the interests of labor who is with him in that attack, however we may agree with him in some of the main principles he lays down. I should like also to assure you, though the assurance seems hardly necessary, that several of the clergy associated with Dr. De Costa in that society are by no means blind to the fact that the monopolization of land is the cause of a large amount of poverty, and its consequent evil "class clarity." However rapid may be the progress of our cause in the opening up to all of the natural sources of wealth, there will be, for one or two generations at least, a residuum of poverty, ignorance, imbecility and vice, in dealing with which some agency similar to that of the Charity organization society will be a constant necessity.

May I tax your patience a little farther to enter a protest against the occasional unfair attack upon the "Episcopal" church which finds place in your columns. The last slur cast upon us is for praying for our friends who cross the ocean that they may be "guarded from the dangers of the sea, from sickness, from the violence of enemies, and from every evil to which they may be exposed." We had thought that this was at least as "harmless" a prayer as could be offered, and certainly did not suppose that we were impairing the efficiency of the transatlantic steamship lines by repeating it. But your writer neglects to note that we do consider it necessary to pray for railroad travelers, and while the prayer from which he quotes is an occasional prayer which need never be said, we are required three times a week to repeat the petition, "That it may please Thee to preserve all who travel by land or by water," in which the one service is as great as much as in need of God's care as the other. Perhaps if we said our prayers with more faith they might be as effectual in leading officials to a deeper sense of responsibility as are caustic articles in newspapers. Always sincerely yours,

JAMES O. S. HUNTINGTON, Sup. O. H. C.

THE MODERN MIRACLE WORKER.

PATERSON, N. J.—The most peculiar feature of the movement for industrial freedom by breaking down the artificial barriers between work and workers, is the crop of single tax men who want the tariff taxes retained. How they can reconcile tariff taxes on almost all the products of labor with a single tax upon land values only is one of those conundrums which—like the Lady or the Tiger, the Man in the Iron Mask and who struck Billy Patterson—must go without any satisfactory reply. It must be that, ignoring all natural laws, they have come to believe that two bodies can occupy the same space at the same time, and therefore that there can be a single tax only and at the same time taxes on some 4,000 labor products.

Yet when one considers that the blessed tariff has converted this country from a howling wilderness to a smiling garden, it is asking a great deal to require people to forget what they owe to it. The difference between then and now—the fact that in the howling wilderness there was a chance for every one to dig out living, and that the smiling garden is pretty well fenced in and protected by high walls of tariff laws, with broken bottles on top, and Pinkerton game marching around—don't matter much. We who stand outside the wall can enjoy the garden by reading the society column in the newspaper.

Since the wilderness has become a garden, and the garden is fenced in, when the owners want to allow a few men in to work in it, and there are more men waiting at the gates than the owners have use for, the wages of those who do get in can be kept up by adding a few inches to the height of the fence or breaking a few more bottles; but that could not be done without having the fence to begin with.

Of course the fact that when three men want work and there is but work enough for two, wages will be low, don't operate in this garden; the fence changes all that. Were it not for the fence, the only way that wages could be kept up would be to have the owners of the garden need more men than were waiting for a job.

In fact, the fence is even more powerful to work miracles than any saint's relics ever were; like charity, it "blesses him who gives and him who receives," and if he who gives is satisfied as quite as much in need of God's care as the other. Perhaps if we said our prayers with more faith they might be as effectual in leading officials to a deeper sense of responsibility as are caustic articles in newspapers.

E. W. NELLES.

## THE QUESTION OF TAXING MORTGAGES.

MEMPHIS, Tenn.—I have read your answers to the letter in which I sought to point out the inexpediency and injustice of treating the mortgages as a joint owner and of taxing him accordingly, and they do not appear to be very satisfactory and by no means to go to the bottom of the matter.

You say that "the man who lends money on the security of vacant land, standing timber, or a mining privilege, stands on precisely the same equitable footing

## MEN AND THINGS.

A sudden, though unfortunately a very brief glare of light has been thrown upon the public school system of New York, by the recent investigation into Superintendent Jasper's character and fitness for his position. The illumination has been brief, because Mr. Jasper's "vindication" has been prompt, and with the official endorsement of his methods by the board of education, the curtain naturally descends.

Enough has been revealed, however, to furnish very serious food for thought: Two things have been made evident: that the public school system of New York is grievously inadequate to the needs of the city's population, and that the methods of instruction are such as to tend to store the children's memories with a blind knowledge of accepted facts, without giving them any training worth speaking of in the art of using their minds and increasing their stock of knowledge by observation and reasoning. In the higher schools and classes there appears to be ample room for all who seek instruction; but the lower grades are over crowded to a degree that renders anything like efficient teaching an impossibility. And the method of determining the merit of teachers and scholars by the number of book questions that the pupils can be brought to answer by rote is necessarily prejudicial to education in the true sense of the word.

Why does the state educate her children? Not out of charity or kindness. Were such the reason, it would be difficult to say why public clothing stores and public kitchens, where all who would might be freely clothed and fed, should not be established alongside the public schools. It is in order that they may become good citizens, that the state may escape the awful danger of breeding up a generation of ignorant, irresponsible voters, in whose hands the ballot might prove a frightful weapon of destruction.

Now the first and most essential quality of good citizenship is the ability to think— to sift and weigh evidence and argument—to foresee consequences, to detect fallacies, to know the right thing from the wrong thing, the just from the unjust. In a democracy founded on equal suffrage each man is, to the extent of his own vote, a sovereign, and a sovereign whose power is despotic. And just as an infinite of separate fibers, each one so feeble that an infant's strength can break it, can be twisted into a giant hawser that shall suffice to pull down a steeple, just so may a sufficient number of individual votes be combined into one gigantic power that shall outdo in sheer despotism the czardom of all the Russias.

And this is true, in these times of ours, as in the history of the world it never was before. There are men now living, who within the limits of their recollection have seen greater changes in the factors of civilization—in the methods of wealth production and exchange—than occurred in any five hundred years, of which we have any record, before the opening of the nineteenth century. Compare the slow discovery and settlement of the new world with the rushing development of the force of steam—the tardy, cautious growth of old time commerce with the rapid exchanges and organizations made possible by electricity—the building up of territorial kingdoms with the mushroom-like up-springing of commercial monopolies. With the tremendous mastery mankind has so suddenly obtained over the forces of nature social problems are presenting themselves which, rightly or wrongly, must be solved at once. For good or evil, the men of to-day must decide in what way they will use the genii they have summoned. That the genii will prove profitable servants, or untamed destructive influences, according as we decide to use them, none will deny. Only, how are we going to use them? That is the question fronting us, and which must be answered by the men and women trained and training in our public schools.

Now, in the mere memorizing of rules of arithmetic, and of facts in geography and history, what is there to fit a human being for the study of the great problem of the day—the question of securing to labor its full opportunity and its full reward? What to our school children is the source of knowledge? Not examination and discovery—not weighing of evidence and careful judgment—but blind acceptance of authority. The book says so, or the teacher says so, or somebody says so who is supposed to know. It is not by methods such as this that men are taught to claim their rights as freemen, and to maintain them unimpeded.

And the pity of it is that we pursue this system, not in ignorance, but out of mere indolence. We know better. The science of education is no mystery. We could train our children to use their minds if we only would. But it is less trouble to find out what book questions a pupil can answer than what he really knows. And so we grade our teachers efficient or incapable according as they turn out a greater or less number of pupils who can give set answers to set questions, and send out into the world year after year fresh thousands of young men and women who are made to believe that they have received a "good common school education," when in reality we have given them nothing that can properly be defined as an education of any kind.

The *Star*, alone among the London dailies, recognizes the true cause of the evil, and points out that it is of little use to try to check the growth of poverty in London while land values are left to be appropriated by private individuals. Meantime the people who live by other people's labor are busily urging, and to some extent applying, their pet panaceas. Technical education is the latest of these. If only the poor wretches in the slums of London can be transformed into skilled work people there will be no more trouble. And actually they have had a meeting at the lord mayor's residence to take steps for raising £150,000 to found a great school of technology. It never seems to occur to these good people that the demand for skilled labor is vastly more limited than

that for unskilled. If every wretched sewing woman in London were a skilled telegrapher or typewriter, what could they possibly do save to drag down the wages of telegraphers and typewriters without raising those of sewing women?

The English house of lords committee continues its investigation into the ways and methods of the "sweaters." Not a little indignation has been aroused over evidence showing that such aristocratic labor employers as Poole and Redfern have been on the whole as willing to avail themselves of the services of sweaters as the more humble dealers in sloop clothing. The two great tailoring houses will be made to bear a certain amount of odium which they ought justly to escape, since it is no tyranny of theirs, but the great social crime of land monopoly that has wrought the evil. But the introduction of their names has had one distinctly good result. It has effectively disposed of the claim that the sweating system flourishes because employers can't afford to pay high wages. No protective tariff that ever was devised could maintain prices at an abnormal level half so effectually as is done by the degrees of fashion that certain things shall be bought at certain places and nowhere else. If employers paid high wages simply because they realized large profits, the people who work for Poole and Redfern would have little cause of complaint.

As might be expected, the evils of the sweating system are as rampant in Paris as in London. Indeed, it is probable that they are greater in the French capital; the trained economy of the people enabling the standard of subsistence to sink to a far lower point of cost, and thus distributing misery among a greater number of people.

The Parisian municipality has taken up the question, and adopted a series of ordinances which they think will diminish the evil. Hereafter, whoever contracts to perform any work for the municipality must do so subject to the following regulations:

The employment of sub-contractors, task-masters, or sweaters (marchandeurs) is formally forbidden.

The workmen employed for the works of the town must be working directly for the concessionists or contractors, and not for any intermediary.

The normal duration of a day's work shall not exceed nine hours of effective work, and there shall be one day's rest per week.

Another regulation provides that the wages paid by contractors shall never fall below a certain minimum, which is a little above the rate paid by ordinary private employers. Where overtime is unavoidable there is stipulated an increase of twenty-five per cent for day work and double pay for night work.

All this is only doing, in a different way, and to a less degree, what the Bourbon kings did when they artificially cheapened the price of bread in Paris—selling it there for less than cost. The roads swarmed with people from other towns, making their way toward the favored city, where bread was cheap. The new ordinances recognize the possibility of an effect of this kind, for one clause provides that no contractor shall be permitted to employ more than one foreigner for every ten persons in his service.

The United States maintains an expensive academy at Annapolis, in Maryland, besides a small fleet of training ships and a force of officers and seamen, all for the purpose of giving a number of young gentlemen a costly and very complete education, not only free of charge, but absolutely free of all expenses whatever. It would be an exaggeration, perhaps, to say that the United States navy is maintained at a terrific cost for the sole purpose of providing for these young gentlemen after graduation from the naval academy; but it is unquestionable that that is at least one, and by no means the least important, of the functions of the navy. Every graduate is entitled to enter the service if there is a vacancy for him; and if no vacancy exists, he gets a year's pay and an honorable discharge, and is left to make his own way in the world, with the advantage of an education such as few young men can command.

Surely all this is liberal enough. So liberal, indeed, that it is hard to find ground on which it can be defended. The best that can be said for it is that it secures to the government, though at a terrible expense, the services of a specially expert set of men, who have given evidence of their fitness by passing a searching examination before graduation.

But now comes the news from Washington that at the examinations held this month at Annapolis, thirteen out of a graduating class of twenty-three were found deficient in their knowledge of steam engineering and therefore could not pass. Upon which, by instruction from somebody in authority, the requirements were modified, a new examination held, and the thirteen, passing triumphantly, were gratified with a year's pay each and honorably discharged. Between jobbery of this kind and dispensing with the examination altogether is only a difference of degree.

There is a prospect of a fresh set of fishery complications—this time with the government of Denmark. A thoughtless government has made the coast of Greenland a great resort for halibut, and the fishermen of Gloucester have found it out and are going there to catch them. This displeases the Danish owners of Greenland, who look upon the halibut as their property, and they have consequently issued a circular of warning, notifying their intention to seize and confiscate any fishing vessel found in those parts.

The Rev. Lyman Abbott, in his new pulpit at Plymouth church last Sunday, took up his testimony against the present industrial system, which he looks upon as the fruitful parent of social ills, and which apparently he expects to see swept away, or at all events seriously modified, by some special act of Providence. "The name of Christ," said Dr. Abbott, "I demand of the social system that it shall not be perfected by the accomplishments of competition, but that every man who wants work

shall be able to get it, and that he shall be permitted to earn his bread by the sweat of his brow."

Yes; but how? There are just two things needed to secure a man work—first, a place to work in or on, and, second, material to work with. Given those, and no man need be idle. Deny either one of them, or let private individuals monopolize the supply of either one, so that they can either charge blackmail for the use of it, or forbid its use on any terms, and straightway it becomes inevitable that the man who wants work should not be able to get it by virtue of that very competition that Dr. Abbott wishes to see swept away.

It is a pity that men like Dr. Abbott should strain their eyes with gazing toward the distant mountain peaks, looking for a special deliverance to come from the mysterious beyond, when right before their very feet lies the path that leads to safety if they would but see it and take it.

The speeches and reports made at the annual congress of British and Irish co-operative societies show that the advocates of this form of industrial organization are beginning to appreciate the difficulties of their system, if not to understand its fatal imperfections. The principal discussion was on the subject of co-operative production; and the question to which no satisfactory answer could be found was, how can co-operative production be carried on so as to avoid making of it an engine of oppression greater than any of the non-co-operative systems now in vogue. Is there any difference, so far as the outside world is concerned, between a thousand men banded together in a co-operative association for the making of shoes, and a shoe making corporation employing a thousand laborers, save that the former, by superior efficiency, may possibly force down the price of shoes, and thus diminish the wages of non-co-operative shoemakers? The speaker at the congress sought to find a solution of this difficulty in universal organized co-operation, and with more or less indefiniteness pronounced in favor of state socialism. One speaker, indeed, Mr. G. E. Quirk, boldly faced the question, and declared that every co-operative society must be run in the interest of its members without regard to the interests of other people. "The primary purpose of all trade, commerce or manufacture," said Mr. Quirk, "is to make a profit, to benefit and enrich in the first instance those immediately concerned, and the men who profess to be actuated by any other motives, to be disinterested, and to sell their merchandise and manufacture their wares from pure philanthropy and from a desire to benefit their fellow men, are guilty of the most transparent hypocrisy and cant, and will have to tell their story to other than hard headed Britons to be believed." Mr. Quirk's common sense utterance, however, met with no favor, and was condemned by nearly every delegate who spoke.

One peculiarity of the representatives of the co-operative idea who assembled in this congress was their curious confusion of thought about the meaning of the terms production and distribution. Production, according to their definition, ends with the process of manufacturing; the warehouse, the retail store, and other machinery for continuing the process of production until the goods reach consumers, are regarded by them as factors of distribution. Thus, they speak of a co-operative store as distributive co-operation; but of a co-operative factory as productive co-operation.

This confusion of thought renders them singularly unable to make any correct estimate of the merits of such co-operative schemes as have already been brought into successful operation. It is in evidence, for example, that the great co-operative stores, especially in London, have had considerable to do with the development of the sweating system, not only by their own efforts to obtain goods at constantly lower prices, but by forcing their competitors in business to cut wages down to the last possible penny. But the members of the congress regard this condition of affairs with perfect equanimity. For, they say, these stores are solving the problem of distribution, and can safely afford to leave the productive system to take care of itself. From men so disastrously ignorant of economic terminology little can be hoped in the way of clear thought and correct reasoning.

The evil possibilities of our system of jury trials were well illustrated in a case tried in Baltimore last week before Judge Duffy. The question was as to the validity of a will by which the testator, a wealthy Baltimore builder, absolutely disinherited his five children by a first wife, and left his entire property to the second wife and her children. The jury reported several times that there was no prospect of their agreeing, but Judge Duffy flatly refused to discharge them, declaring that he would keep them locked up for a month or more, if necessary, until they should find a verdict. As a result of this threat, the jury brought in a verdict sustaining the will.

It is hardly necessary to say that a verdict so obtained cannot by any possibility represent the honest, unbiased opinion of the entire jury. The effect of Judge Duffy's threat was that some members of the jury deliberately violated their oaths, and assented to a finding which in their hearts they believed to be unjust. If the plaintiffs in the case had sought to influence the jury by bribes or threats of violence, they would have done, in defiance of the law, precisely what Judge Duffy did as an administrator of the law.

**Skins Tax League Notes.**  
The clerk of the league reports the membership slowly but steadily increasing.

W. and M. W. M. say: "Have had a group working, which was organized before the foundation of the league. It has frequent meetings, with lively discussions and much interest manifested."

T. P. B. of Brooklyn thinks the group idea one of the best for propagating the faith, and has no doubt that it will be to many what he hopes it will be to him, a return to social pleasures that have been put aside to advance the single tax principles.

C. W. D. of Sailors' Snug Harbor, N. Y.

writes to join the league and express his hearty approval of it. He says: "It would pain me to miss one word that Mr. George has written. I have read all of his published works and distributed six complete sets of them, together with five hundred tracts, among my acquaintances. I regard it an honor to help this cause, which is the cause of all humanity, by every means in my power."

## ELECTRICITY IN PRODUCTION AND EXCHANGE.

The electric railway has begun to displace the horse car line and the more modern cable road in America. According to the *Electric Age* there are already one hundred and thirty miles of road in operation on this continent. Of this number twenty-one miles are in operation in Pennsylvania, sixteen miles in New York, ten in Ohio and eighty-three miles in New Jersey, Maryland, Colorado, Michigan, California, Alabama, Virginia, Kansas, Delaware, Rhode Island and Ontario combined. There are in course of construction, or contracted for, one hundred and fifty additional miles. These roads, constructed and in course of construction, are located in sixty-five towns and cities.

The various systems employ for the most part an overhead wire, which is tapped by the car as it moves along the track. The current used in one of these systems is of very low tension, so that there is no danger of fatal accidents from contact with the wires. In the storage battery system the car carries its own motive power along with it in the shape of electrical energy boxed up in storage batteries. This plan has been successfully tried in St. Louis and on the Fourth avenue line in New York city.

Another application of electricity to railroading has been made by the Cumberland Valley railroad. The company has a car for the purpose of furnishing electric lights for picnics, camp meetings, removing wrecks after dark, and various other purposes. It is a common box car, strongly built, and in which is an 84 horse power boiler and engine, which runs fifteen lamp dynamo. Each lamp is 2,000 candle power. There is a reel containing three miles of insulated wire, and all the appliances necessary to supply lights at any reasonable distance from the track. It is said that it paid for itself in one year by the increased sale of tickets to picnics and camp meetings. The Pennsylvania railroad also hired it to light up the removal of a bad wreck at Duncannon. It is now proposed, too, to apply a method of welding metals by electricity to steel rails. A Baltimore electrician has invented a process by which the ends of the rails are firmly welded after they are laid on the track, and the joint is afterward made as hard as the rest of the rail. It is claimed that the joint can be made in half a minute. The proposal is to thus make rails a quarter of a mile long, and the consequent smooth travel would be said to effect a great saving of wear and tear to rails, wheels and cars.

How simple is the operation of even the more intricate electrical appliances is shown by what has recently been done by some farmers in Michigan. There has grown up in a county in that state a telegraph system which might be generally extended throughout the rural districts everywhere. The system began by two farmers connecting their houses with a wire for their own convenience and operating their line with the ordinary Morse instruments. Gradually other farmers extended the line to their houses, and after a time the wire was run into the neighboring village. Seven years ago the combined farmers and a few village merchants organized themselves into a company, and it has since been extended until now it has sixty-five miles of wire and ninety offices, two-thirds of the latter being in farm houses, and nearly all the rest in stores where these farmers do their trading.

The use of electric lights by steamships has shortened the passage through the Suez canal very materially. In 1887 the average time of passage was only thirty-four hours. The fastest passage made by a steamer using the electric light was a trifle over fifteen hours. The American yacht *Namouna*, being permitted to steam faster than a large steamer, went through in thirteen hours and fifty-three minutes.

In other branches of industry the new force is being used more and more every day. Electric motors can now be classed as a new shop tool. Any one can run them with one-half hour's previous instruction. Blowers, elevators for foundries, scrap shears and trip hammers for smith shops; flexible shafts, punches and drills in tank and boiler shops; paint mills, grind stones, transfer tables, cranes and hydraulic lifts everywhere, are some of the appliances which can be easily and economically operated by electric power. When wanted this power is instantly ready, and when shut off the expense ceases.

## The Ways of the Puget Sound Lumber Ring.

WISTON, Wash. Ter.—Here is a clipping from the Seattle *Post-Intelligencer*, describing the methods of the Puget sound loggers in keeping up the price of lumber.

At the regular monthly meeting of the Puget sound loggers' association last evening, it was unanimously decided to curtail one-third the output of logs. The balance of the year, commencing Jan. 1. The matter was fully discussed, but there was no opposition to the measure, as it was the general opinion that too many logs were being put into the water to keep prices at living rates. The opinion was generally expressed that if the heavy reduction made was not sufficient, a still further reduction would be made or the camps shut down entirely October 1, or before.

The principal features of the platform adopted at St. Louis were the endorsement of the free trade views as expressed in the message by President Cleveland, and also the endorsement of the Mills bill now pending in congress. The effect of this action will be to make the issue clear and distinct. After years of trimming we have the vital issue, free trade or protection, before the American people, for them to decide.—*New York Press*.

It was inevitable that there should be a clash and a stubborn conflict over the tariff question at St. Louis. It does not follow from this fact that there is any serious division in the democratic party on that question. It was merely a last and desperate attempt of a small number of die-hards, acting in the interest of a group of wealthy and influential monopolists, to bevel the convention and the party.—*New York Evening Journal* (Rep.)

The high tariff men argue that all the nations that have adopted high tariffs are getting rich. Why not all the nations adopt high tariff, and all get rich? Do you see the point? They could undoubtedly all fill up the treasuries, but where would the money come from? It would come from the people; it would be a sick way of robbing the people. Our plan is absolute free trade, and let governments be supported by direct taxation.—*Boise City, Idaho, Republican*.

The principal features of the platform adopted at St. Louis were the endorsement of the free trade views as expressed in the message by President Cleveland, and also the endorsement of the Mills bill now pending in congress. The effect of this action will be to make the issue clear and distinct. After years of trimming we have the vital issue, free trade or protection, before the American people, for them to decide.—*New York Press*.

It was inevitable that there should be a clash and a stubborn conflict over the tariff question at St. Louis. It does not follow from this fact that there is any serious division in the democratic party on that question. It was merely a last and desperate attempt of a small number of die-hards, acting in the interest of a group of wealthy and influential monopolists, to bevel the convention and the party.—*New York Evening Journal* (Rep.)

Such early and apparently hearty unanimity upon a ticket and a definite policy of tariff revision and surplus reduction will give the democrats advantage at the start. They will enter upon the contest with strong candidates, with an aim and a purpose, and with their backs to the wall. It would seem that nothing but the leadership of such a candidate as Judge Gresham and a liberal and progressive tariff and tax reduction policy could save the republicans.—*Springfield Republican* (Rep.).

The cut and dried programme of the St. Louis convention, so far as Mr. Cleveland is concerned, has been carried out. He has been renominated without a sign of opposition. His renomination settles the issue of the Mills bill now pending in congress. The effect of this action will be to make the issue clear and distinct. After years of trimming we have the vital issue, free trade or protection, before the American people, for them to decide.—*New York Commercial Advertiser* (Rep.).

It was inevitable that there should be a clash and a stubborn conflict over the tariff question at St. Louis. It does not follow from this fact that there is any serious division in the democratic party on that question. It was merely a last and desperate attempt of a small number of die-hards, acting in the interest of a group of wealthy and influential monopolists, to bevel the convention and the party.—*New York Evening Journal* (Rep.).

The republicans are much frightened about the tariff agitation leading in time to an easy master to show them the way to the logical end.

D. C. DAVID,  
Secretary V. P. Farmers' Union.

## Why Not Lay Mains at Public Expense and Pay for Them Out of the Enhanced Land Values?

Toronto, June 16.—The village of York sets an example to Toronto in compelling the owners of the property to benefit by the payment of taxes for the water mains.

It has been plodded of some hundreds of thousands of dollars in the past to pay for water mains that were laid in advance of the public needs, and that would not have been laid till some years afterward if there had not been speculative land grabbers to conciliate. Many miles of pipe have been laid through unproductive property to benefit somebody's ad-

ditional property, but the cost has been so great that the owners could not have afforded to keep it up.

The present system plays into the hands of the vacant lot owner and should be

**Cornhill Magazine. Turned GE.**  
There, hang up the bill 'ook, missus, and give us pipe and a light;  
"Ain't I ready for supper?" No, thank's, I wants no supper to-night;  
"Twill be time enough when I'm hungry to turn to the victuals and drink.  
To-night all I wants is the bacby, and to sit by the fire and think;  
What about? Wor it that ye ever axin' Lor' bless 'er, poor soul, I forgot.  
I hasn't as yet bin and told 'er—and yet I'd as lief be shot,  
Like our lad as went out for a soper last year in the Injin tight;  
All tell 'er, the poor old missus, why I can't eat up supper to-night!  
Yet tell 'er I man, same as Joey was forced to stand there stock still.  
And face them dawlin' of Injins as they swarn'd on 'em down the 'ill,  
And the longer yer waits for to do it, why the wusser it be, I'pose,  
So, I'll just get my pipe well started—that's it—and then or I goes!

Well, missus, I've got news for yer, but yer maun' now, take it amiss.  
When we lost our Joey yer bore up, and so yer maun do over this,  
Not as this'ere time, for bless yer, it's only thing like as black—  
It's only my lord's goin' a tourin', and I well I've got the sack!  
There, don't say no 'ard things, missus, it ain't my lord's fault, mebbe;  
"E's allers fair enough spoken, and her ledgyship, so's she;  
But as the folks says at the orifice (tis them in course 's to speak),  
They must begin savin' somewhere, and I cors't 'em twelve shillin' a week.  
There's them felers, yer says, in powder, and her ledgyship's pair 'o' cobs,  
As she spansk to church in the summer, or a goin' to 'ave ten with the nobs,  
And the chap as they calls 'er "tiger" (tho' why playzis my old crown!)  
And then deer we gets never a taste on'y, yer says, don't they put them down?  
Or them horcoids my lord's so crazed with each blossom, as Ise 'card said,  
If yer reckons one year wi' another, corsting over a guinea a 'ead!

And the phyeants as stands in a pot, too, by the time they're ready for killin'—  
Why don't they, yer says, put them down, afore they docks my twelve shillin'?  
There, I can't tell yer, missus; says passon—  
some things 're on earth below,  
It's no sort of use to inquire on; yer isn't supposed to know;  
And this'ere on 'em, mebbe; and passon 'e's no bad chap,  
And things ain't a goin' so easy as they used to wi' 'im, mayhap!  
Still, my feyther, 'e served my lord's feyther, as Ise for this 'un, yer see.  
Worked, too, for my lord's grandfeyther, as ever since just a lad from Collidge's took to the title and 'states.  
And it's 'ard when ye're high agen sixty, to be turned like a tramp from the gates!  
But there, I's too old for them meets they talks on, the younger chaps,  
And flags, and trans bands, and what not,  
Days passon, the lord 's willed it, so I'ad best, too, be willin';  
And the workus, mebbe, at sixty, is as good, arter all, as twelve shillin'!

## A MORMON'S STORY.

It was in 1873. The bishops, and elders, and the leaders of the Mormon church had been summoned from all the stakes of Zion to decide, in a general conference, what the saints should do if the general government carried out its threats. The discussion was long and serious and ended in the reference of the whole matter to the Council of Seventy, who immediately went into secret session. What was the actual decision of that council no man knows to this day; but when they adjourned the rumor spread like wildfire that it had been determined to burn all the towns, depart from Utah forever and drive the stakes of the church a new in Mexico.

My friend John Paine, in whose house I was a guest at the time, spoke of the matter when he came home that evening—not discontentedly, or with any air of bravado, but in a sober matter of fact, way, and as quietly as if the question under discussion was simply one of removal from one house to another. I do not mean to say that there was no indignation in John's speech. On the contrary, he felt a keen sense of injustice, and made no effort to conceal it. But his indignation was on behalf of the community, not of himself. He spoke of the suffering the church would have to endure, of the cruelty with which she was being treated by the government; but of any loss to himself personally he had never a word to say. The prospect of applying the torch to his own house—of having to destroy with his own hands his pleasant, well-furnished home—seemed to have no special terror for him.

This seemed to me very extraordinary. I could not believe that it was possible for a man to really sink his own identity so completely. It seemed to me that at the bottom of John Paine's heart there must be a certain amount of unwillingness to obey the mandate which would make him a homeless wanderer.

"Look here, John," I said. "You're not absolutely compelled to go, even if the church should so decide. Any one who wants to stay behind can do so, can't he?"

"Oh, yes. Any one who wants to stay, can stay. But I'll go with the church wherever she goes."

I said, "Would you burn down your home at the orders of the council, and tramp with them to Mexico—burn the beautiful place you and your family have—leave it, not knowing whether you will ever get another?"

"If," said Paine unhesitatingly, "the church should order me to rise up at twelve o'clock to-night, burn my house and all my property, and follow her on foot, I would do it unhesitatingly."

I began to see my friend, John Paine, in a new light. I had lived in his house with him, eaten at his table, had many a long talk with him over our after supper pipes; and through it all he had impressed me simply as a pleasant, good natured, harmless sort of man, just in his dealings, and moving contentedly along in a somewhat narrow groove, without enthusiasm to urge him on to greater things, or ability to perform them. Now he stood revealed to me as a man who for the sake of his

religion was ready to make the greatest sacrifices. And around him was a whole community—a small nation—of men equally fanatical and self-sacrificing.

What could be the secret of this strange power of the Mormon church? What was there in its doctrines to inspire such devotion? John's wife and aged mother were sitting in the room with us. They knew the doom that was impending over them. They could not but be thinking that within a few days, or even hours, they might be wandering forth homeless, struck down into poverty at one blow. Yet they made no loud complaints—indulged in no spoken forebodings. They seemed tranquilly content that all would be for the best. What could be the secret of it?

I sat and smoked in silence, and I suppose my face betrayed my perplexity, for at last Paine said:

"It seems to astonish you that I should have faith enough in my church to be willing to obey her orders?"

"Yes," I said, "it does." Among us gentiles the man who should deliberately fling away all his property because his church told him to would be looked on as a lunatic. And the church that should make such a demand of its disciples would find its membership waste away like hoarfrost before the sun."

"And yet," said John, "your ministers preach to you about the goodness of God, don't they? They tell you how Christ bids you take no thought for the morrow, and lay up no treasure on earth? They teach you that the Lord will provide for you just as He does for the fowls of the air—eh?"

"Oh, yes. They tell us all that. But they explain that such things are not to be understood literally. In fact, as I understand it, those promises don't refer to the present time at all; but to some future age of the world when all men shall be converted to the principles of Christianity."

"Just so," said John. "But, you see, what your church teaches is an abstract idea, having no application in the present, our church teaches as a living truth. We really believe that the Lord will provide, and we're not the least afraid to trust to Him to do it. Would you like to hear my experience of Mormonism?"

"Indeed I should," I answered.

"All right," said John. "We're none of us inclined for sleep to-night, and I'll tell it to you now."

This is John Paine's story as he told it me that night in 1873 to while away the time while we waited for the order to burn his house:

"I was born in a little Scotch hamlet, on an estate belonging to the duke of Buccleugh. My parents were hard working, sober, frugal, honest people. I need not say they were poor. My father was a stone cutter by trade, but did laboring work of any kind that he could get to do. My mother kept the cottage, made the family's clothes, and was thankful to go out for a day's work whenever opportunity offered. We just did manage to get along, and that was all. Our food was chiefly oatmeal porridge, and as for clothing—well, I can't say that father and mother never had any new clothes, but I know we children never had any. My father's coats and trousers came down to me by way of my two elder brothers; and by the time they reached me it would have been hard to tell what the original material had been, so covered were they with patches.

I don't know that I was a particularly enterprising boy; but as I grew toward manhood I made up my mind that I must leave home. There didn't seem to be work enough in our village to go round.

Perhaps some newspaper stories I remember reading had something to do with my decision, but at all events I was fixed to go. My father talked against it at first, but came round when he saw how hard it was. And so, soon after my seventeenth birthday, I left the village one morning, with less than five shillings in my pocket and the world before me.

"Well, sir, I made my way to Scotland and entered on my mission. It was not long before I found an opportunity to visit the hamlet where I was born. Sir, the little village had been wiped out of existence to make way for some improvements of the duke's. My father was dead; my brothers and sisters were scattered, heaven only knew where; and the mother that bore me was an inmate of the poorhouse! Guess if I lacked a text and an illustration for my preaching to the peoplen!"

"Ah, well; my mission ended long ago, and my life since then has been as you see it now. Here I am to-night, with the mother, and wife, and the bairns around me, and nothing worse likely to happen than that we may be called to follow the church that has done so much for us, and that we love so well, to some new location. I can assure you, my friend, that prospect doesn't worry us much!"

We sat awhile in silence. There was a question I wanted to ask, but I hesitated about putting it. At last I spoke:

"Look here, Paine," I said, "I can understand that gratitude and religious enthusiasm will support you under a heavier trial than that which seems impending over you. But, honestly now, don't you look forward with dread to the years of poverty before you?"

"Poverty?" said John. "I don't understand. What poverty?"

"Why," I said, "if you destroy all you've got here, and move away, it will take you a generation to accumulate as much wealth again."

John looked puzzled for a minute, and then he laughed. He really did.

"Ah, Mac," he said, "do you really think we'll have to save for years to make ourselves as wealthy as we are now?"

Man alive, can't you see that all we have was made out of earth and air by the labor of our own hands? When we move, our hands go with us, and wherever we may drive our stakes, you may be sure there'll be plenty of earth and air for the hands to work on. A year hence we shall be as wealthy as we are now, while these plains will be going back into arid alkali wastes. That's the secret of the church, my boy. She brings hand and land together. That's why there's no poverty in Zion."

Well, one Sunday evening, in a little English village, there was a crowd gathered on the common, and I joined it without thinking why. A man was talking—a sort of itinerant preacher I took him to be—and I stood there with the rest, looking at him talk, but paying no attention to what he said. I knew he was preaching the religion of some kind, but I had lost

all faith in that sort of thing, and wouldn't have listened if John the Baptist had been preaching. But at last a single sentence forced itself upon my ear, and struck into my soul like a bolt of lightning. "Nowhere," shouted the speaker, "nowhere in or near any of the stakes of Zion can a saint be found who is not sure of supper, bed and breakfast! To all who come we guarantee the means of honest livelihood! The church of the latter day saints permits no such thing as poverty."

"After the missionary had finished his address, I lingered with the crowd that pressed around him. All were asking questions eagerly, and to first one, then another, he gave answers. I waited to the last. The missionary talked with me awhile, then took me by the arm as if I had been indeed the brother that he called me, and led me away. That night I shared his lodging, and until near morning we sat together, he expounding and I eagerly listening to the mysteries of the faith that promised happiness in this world as well as in the world to come.

"Well, there's no use telling how I got to Zion. It was a hard struggle, but through it all I was buoyed up by a great hope. A year and a half from the day of that village meeting I crossed the Wasatch mountains, hungry, ragged, footsore, with no wealth in the world save a letter from my friend the missionary. But when I looked down from that mountain top upon the plains below, and saw, dim in the distance, the temples of Zion, I fell upon my knees and uttered a prayer of thanksgiving from the very bottom of a grateful heart.

"And I found it true, as that good missionary had told me. Here was rest. Here were no rich and no poor. It seemed to me like paradise. The church gave me a home, and furnished me subsistence till I could earn it for myself. The brethren helped me build a little house, and plow and fence my ground. They showed me how to tend and harvest my crop. And almost before I knew it I was master of a little place, with all the ordinary wants of life supplied, and a feeling of independence in my heart such as I had never known before.

"Did they do all these things for me for nothing? Well, yes and no. They let me have from the tithe yard what I most needed, and as I was able I paid for it, for what had been done for me would have to be done for others yet to come. Surely no one could object to that. Then one-tenth of the increase of my possessions were, when I was able, to be turned into the tithe yard, to be used for the same purpose.

"As the years passed, my circumstances improved. Relieved of anxiety for the wants of the body, I developed an appetite of the mind. I read and studied; and while I make no claims to scholarship I may say that I am fairly well educated. And then I met a lassie from the Hielan's—"

"As the years passed, my circumstances improved. Relieved of anxiety for the wants of the body, I developed an appetite of the mind. I read and studied; and while I make no claims to scholarship I may say that I am fairly well educated. And then I met a lassie from the Hielan's—"

"As the years passed, my circumstances improved. Relieved of anxiety for the wants of the body, I developed an appetite of the mind. I read and studied; and while I make no claims to scholarship I may say that I am fairly well educated. And then I met a lassie from the Hielan's—"

"As the years passed, my circumstances improved. Relieved of anxiety for the wants of the body, I developed an appetite of the mind. I read and studied; and while I make no claims to scholarship I may say that I am fairly well educated. And then I met a lassie from the Hielan's—"

"As the years passed, my circumstances improved. Relieved of anxiety for the wants of the body, I developed an appetite of the mind. I read and studied; and while I make no claims to scholarship I may say that I am fairly well educated. And then I met a lassie from the Hielan's—"

"As the years passed, my circumstances improved. Relieved of anxiety for the wants of the body, I developed an appetite of the mind. I read and studied; and while I make no claims to scholarship I may say that I am fairly well educated. And then I met a lassie from the Hielan's—"

"As the years passed, my circumstances improved. Relieved of anxiety for the wants of the body, I developed an appetite of the mind. I read and studied; and while I make no claims to scholarship I may say that I am fairly well educated. And then I met a lassie from the Hielan's—"

"As the years passed, my circumstances improved. Relieved of anxiety for the wants of the body, I developed an appetite of the mind. I read and studied; and while I make no claims to scholarship I may say that I am fairly well educated. And then I met a lassie from the Hielan's—"

"As the years passed, my circumstances improved. Relieved of anxiety for the wants of the body, I developed an appetite of the mind. I read and studied; and while I make no claims to scholarship I may say that I am fairly well educated. And then I met a lassie from the Hielan's—"

"As the years passed, my circumstances improved. Relieved of anxiety for the wants of the body, I developed an appetite of the mind. I read and studied; and while I make no claims to scholarship I may say that I am fairly well educated. And then I met a lassie from the Hielan's—"

"As the years passed, my circumstances improved. Relieved of anxiety for the wants of the body, I developed an appetite of the mind. I read and studied; and while I make no claims to scholarship I may say that I am fairly well educated. And then I met a lassie from the Hielan's—"

"As the years passed, my circumstances improved. Relieved of anxiety for the wants of the body, I developed an appetite of the mind. I read and studied; and while I make no claims to scholarship I may say that I am fairly well educated. And then I met a lassie from the Hielan's—"

"As the years passed, my circumstances improved. Relieved of anxiety for the wants of the body, I developed an appetite of the mind. I read and studied; and while I make no claims to scholarship I may say that I am fairly well educated. And then I met a lassie from the Hielan's—"

"As the years passed, my circumstances improved. Relieved of anxiety for the wants of the body, I developed an appetite of the mind. I read and studied; and while I make no claims to scholarship I may say that I am fairly well educated. And then I met a lassie from the Hielan's—"

"As the years passed, my circumstances improved. Relieved of anxiety for the wants of the body, I developed an appetite of the mind. I read and studied; and while I make no claims to scholarship I may say that I am fairly well educated. And then I met a lassie from the Hielan's—"

"As the years passed, my circumstances improved. Relieved of anxiety for the wants of the body, I developed an appetite of the mind. I read and studied; and while I make no claims to scholarship I may say that I am fairly well educated. And then I met a lassie from the Hielan's—"

"As the years passed, my circumstances improved. Relieved of anxiety for the wants of the body, I developed an appetite of the mind. I read and studied; and while I make no claims to scholarship I may say that I am fairly well educated. And then I met a lassie from the Hielan's—"

"As the years passed, my circumstances improved. Relieved of anxiety for the wants of the body, I developed an appetite of the mind. I read and studied; and while I make no claims to scholarship I may say that I am fairly well educated. And then I met a lassie from the Hielan's—"

"As the years passed, my circumstances improved. Relieved of anxiety for the wants of the body, I developed an appetite of the mind. I read and studied; and while I make no claims to scholarship I may say that I am fairly well educated. And then I met a lassie from the Hielan's—"

"As the years passed, my circumstances improved. Relieved of anxiety for the wants of the body, I developed an appetite of the mind. I read and studied; and while I make no claims to scholarship I may say that I am fairly well educated. And then I met a lassie from the Hielan's—"

"As the years passed, my circumstances improved. Relieved of anxiety for the wants of the body, I developed an appetite of the mind. I read and studied; and while I make no claims to scholarship I may say that I am fairly well educated. And then I met a lassie from the Hielan's—"

"As the years passed, my circumstances improved. Relieved of anxiety for the wants of the body, I developed an appetite of the mind. I read and studied; and while I make no claims to scholarship I may say that I am fairly well educated. And then I met a lassie from the Hielan's—"

"As the years passed, my circumstances improved. Relieved of anxiety for the wants of the body, I developed an appetite of the mind. I read and studied; and while I make no claims to scholarship I may say that I am fairly well educated. And then I met a lassie from the Hielan's—"

"As the years passed, my circumstances improved. Relieved of anxiety for the wants of the body, I developed an appetite of the mind. I read and studied; and while I make no claims to scholarship I may say that I am fairly well educated. And then I met a lassie from the Hielan's—"

"As the years passed, my circumstances improved. Relieved of anxiety for the wants of the body, I developed an appetite of the mind. I read and studied; and while I make no claims to scholarship I may say that I am fairly well educated. And then I met a lassie from the Hielan's—"

"As the years passed, my circumstances improved. Relieved of anxiety for the wants of the body, I developed an appetite of the mind. I read and studied; and while I make no claims to scholarship I may say that I am fairly well educated. And then I met a lassie from the Hielan's—"

"As the years passed, my circumstances improved. Relieved of anxiety for the wants of the body, I developed an appetite of the mind. I read and studied; and while I make no claims to scholarship I may say that I am fairly well educated. And then I met a lassie from the Hielan's—"

"As the years passed, my circumstances improved. Relieved of anxiety for the wants of the body, I developed an appetite of the mind. I read and studied; and

## Song of the High Protectionist.

W. Foss in Pueb.  
Oh, yes, we'll build our commerce up by legal  
And benefit our workingmen by general taxation.  
We'll help the millionaire grow rich without  
And, though we put the brakes on trade, we  
boom the art of smuggling.

We've put a penalty on food; for each protection meeting  
Would adequately stigmatize the heinous vice of eating.  
Against this fine no man should raise a cavil  
But pay a daily license for the privilege of digestion.

We must protect the workingman from European labor,  
Teach him to venerate himself and exalt his neighbor.  
Protect him while he earns enough to grind the government axes  
And gets enough each Saturday to pay his weekly taxes.

We would reform the workingman, and view  
With special loathing His vicious predilection for, and tendency to, clothing.  
And we feel sure no patriot will ever grudge  
The government a daily tax for privilege of living.

## TO WORKINGMEN.

Belford's Magazine for June.

I am one of those who believe that it is possible for workingmen to raise wages by an intelligent use of their votes; that this is the only way in which wages can be generally and permanently raised—the only way labor can obtain that share of wealth which is justly its due. And I am one of those who believe that this is the supreme object that workingmen should seek in politics. In seeking to raise wages, to improve the conditions of labor, we are seeking, not the good of a class, but the good of the whole. The number of those who can live on the labor of others is and can be but small as compared with the number who must labor to live. And where labor yields the largest results to the laborer, where the production of wealth is largest and its distribution most equitable, where the man who has nothing but his labor is surest of making the most comfortable living and best providing for those whom nature has made dependent upon him, there, I believe, will be the best conditions of life for all—

and where the general standard of intelligence and virtue is highest, and there will all that makes a nation truly great and strong and glorious most abound.

But if such a plan of raising wages is utterly hopeless, what should we say of a plan to raise wages by levying a tax upon all laborers and giving the proceeds, not to all laborers, or even to some laborers, but only to some employers? This is the plan of protection. If protection can increase or maintain wages, it must be in this way. What protective duties actually do is to increase the profits of certain employers—to allow them to collect a tax from their fellow citizens without any stipulation as to how they shall spend it. To suppose that wages can be increased in this way is to suppose, in the first place, that these protected employers voluntarily give up their increased profits to their workmen, and to suppose, in the second place, that the increase of wages which the benevolence of the protected employer thus causes in industries which at the best employ not more than 1,500,000 people can raise wages in occupations that employ 20,000,000 people!

## PRODUCTION REDUCES WAGES.

Observing also that the first step in this previous scheme of plunder which is called protection to American labor is really to reduce wages. Money is the mere flux and counter of exchanges. What the man who works for wages really works for are commodities and services for which he pays with the money he receives in wages. Necessarily, therefore, to increase the price of the commodities he must buy with his money wages is to decrease his real wages. For instance, a good many of the highly protected American laborers in the state of Pennsylvania (as in some other states) are compelled by their benevolent protectionist employers to make their purchases with the highly protected American laborers all "pluck-me stores." In fact, it is through these pluck-me stores that these highly protected and prosperous American workingmen get their wages, as the pluck-me bill is deducted from what is coming to them as wages before any money is turned over to them on pay days; and many of them being kept constantly in debt, hardly see a dollar from one year's end to another. Now, it is evident that if one of these employers adds a dollar to the price his men have to pay for the goods they must buy in his "pluck-me," he just effectually cuts down their real earnings as though he reduced their wages by a dollar. And so it is evident that the protective taxes which we impose for the purpose of increasing the prices of commodities must in the same way operate to reduce the real wages of labor. Therefore for the protective scheme for raising wages fully stated is simply this: Wages generally are in the first place reduced by taxes which increase the price of certain commodities, in order that a comparatively few employers who profit by this increase in the price of what they have to sell may benevolently increase the wages of their employees, and that this benevolent raising of wages in some occupations may cause the raising of wages in all occupations!

In the coming campaign the most frantic appeals will be made to workingmen to vote for protection. You will be told that "protection" means "protection to American labor"; that is, that it was instituted for, and that is why it is maintained; that it is protection that makes this country so prosperous and your wages so high, and that if it is abolished, or even interfered with, mills must close, mines shut down, and poor labor stand idle and starve until American men are forced to work for the lowest wages that are paid in Europe.

Don't accept what any one tells you—least of all what is told you by and on behalf of those who have an enormous pecuniary interest in maintaining what is styled "protection." Hear what they say, and make up your minds for yourselves. There is nothing in the tariff question that cannot readily be mastered by any one of ordinary intelligence, and the great question whether what is called "protection" does or does not benefit the laborer can be settled for himself by any one who will ask himself what protection really is, and how it benefits labor.

## WHAT IS PROTECTION?

Now what is "protection"? It is a system of taxes levied on imports for the purpose of increasing the price of certain commodities in our own country so that the home producers of such commodities can get higher prices for what they sell to their own fellow countrymen.

This is all there is to "protection." Protection can't enable any American producer to get higher prices for what he sells to people of other countries, and no duty is protective unless it so increases prices as to enable some one to get more from his fellow citizens than he could without protection. How "protection" may thus benefit some people is perfectly clear. But how can it benefit the whole people? That it may increase the profits of the manufacturer, or the income of the owner of timber or mineral land, is plain. But how can it increase wages? "Protection" raises the price of commodities. That may be to the advantage of those who buy labor and sell commodities. But how can it be to the advantage of those who sell labor and buy commodities?

Never mind the confused and confusing claims that are put forth for "protection" until you can see how it can do what is claimed for it.

Ask yourselves what "protection" is and how it operates, and you will see that the only way it can benefit any one, or by "encouraging" him give him power to encourage or benefit any one else, is by enabling him to get from the fellow citizens more than he could otherwise get. This is the essence of protection; and if it has any stimulating or beneficial effect it must be through this. The protective effect of any protective duty is precisely that of a subsidy paid by the government to some people out of taxes levied on the whole people. The only difference is that in what is called the subsidy system the government tax gatherers would collect the tax from the whole people and pay it over to some people, and in what is called the protective system the government tax gatherers only collect a tax on foreign goods so as to "protect" the favored people, while they for themselves collect taxes on the fellow citizens in increased prices.

WHAT PROTECTION DOES FOR WORKMEN.

Now if workmen get any benefit from what is thus called protection, it can only be through the protected employers and by their favor. The protective system gives nothing whatever to labor. It gives only to the employers of labor, and only to some of them. And these some are necessarily comparatively few. It is utterly impossible that

any protective tariff can "protect" the largest industries of any country, for a duty levied upon goods some of which are produced in the country and some of which are imported or would be imported if it were not for the duty. Import duties cannot be levied upon things of which we produce enough for ourselves and consequently do not import, or of which we produce more than enough for ourselves and consequently export; and if levied upon things we do not produce and must import or go without, they can have no protective effect. In every country, therefore, the protected industries can only be those in which but a small part of the labor of that country is employed. In this country, out of over twenty millions of laborers of one sort or another, those employed in the protected industries do not amount to more than 1,500,000, and these industries, it is to be observed, are those in which large capital is required and it is impossible for the mere laborer to employ himself.

Now, would it be possible by levying a general tax (especially a tax which, like all protective taxes, bears on the poor far more heavily than on the rich, on the laborer far more heavily than on the capitalist) and paying out the proceeds directly to the laborers engaged in certain industries, to raise wages, or even to raise wages in those industries? Every one who thinks a moment will say no. If we were to levy such a tax and pay out the proceeds directly to glass workers or iron ore miners or the hands in cotton or woolen factories, in addition to what they get from their employers, the consequence would simply be that labor would be attracted from the unsubsidized to the subsidized employers, and wages would go down to a point as they say, to protect them from the competition of "foreign pauper labor" the very men who are most ready to avail themselves of foreign labor!

But if such a plan of raising wages is utterly hopeless, what should we say of a plan to raise wages by levying a tax upon all laborers and giving the proceeds, not to all laborers, or even to some laborers, but only to some employers? This is the plan of protection. If protection can increase or maintain wages, it must be in this way. What protective duties actually do is to increase the profits of certain employers—to allow them to collect a tax from their fellow citizens without any stipulation as to how they shall spend it. To suppose that wages can be increased in this way is to suppose, in the first place, that these protected employers voluntarily give up their increased profits to their workmen, and to suppose, in the second place, that the increase of wages which the benevolence of the protected employer thus causes in industries which at the best employ not more than 1,500,000 people can raise wages in occupations that employ 20,000,000 people!

IT IS IMPOSSIBLE FOR ANY PROTECTED EMPLOYER, NO MATTER HOW MANY MILLIONS HE MAY HAVE MADE OUT OF THE TARIFF, WHO PAYS ANY HIGHER WAGES TO LABOR THAN HE HAS TO. IT IS NOT TRUE THAT IN ALL THE PROTECTED INDUSTRIES WAGES ARE, IF ANYTHING, LOWER THAN IN THE UNPROTECTED INDUSTRIES. IT IS NOT TRUE THAT IN ALL THE PROTECTED INDUSTRIES WORKMEN HAVE BEEN COMPELLED TO BAND THEMSELVES TOGETHER TO PROTECT THEMSELVES; AND THAT THESE PROTECTED INDUSTRIES ARE THE INDUSTRIES NOTABLE ABOVE ALL OTHERS FOR THEIR STRIKES, THEIR LOCKOUTS, THE BITTER AND OFTEN DISASTROUS INDUSTRIAL WARS THAT LABOR IS COMPELLED TO WAGE TO PREVENT BEING CROWDED TO STARVATION RATES! ARE THESE THE MEN WHO PROTECT YOU?

IT IS IMPOSSIBLE FOR ME IN A BRIEF ARTICLE LIKE THIS TO GO OVER ALL THE CLAIMS AND EXPOSE ALL THE FALLACIES OF PROTECTION. THAT I HAVE ALREADY DONE, IN ANTICIPATION OF THE COMING BEFORE THE PEOPLE OF THIS QUESTION, IN A LITTLE BOOK ENTITLED "PROTECTION OR FREE TRADE," IN WHICH I HAVE SHOWN THE FULL RELATIONS OF THE TARIFF QUESTION TO THE LABOR QUESTION. ALL I WANT HERE TO DO IS TO URGE EVERY AMERICAN WORKMEN TO THINK OVER THE MATTER FOR HIMSELF, AND TO DECIDE WHETHER WHAT IS CALLED "PROTECTION" IS OR IS NOT IN THE INTERESTS OF THE MEN WHO EARN THEIR DAILY BREAD BY THEIR DAILY LABOR.

IF PROTECTION IS GOOD, WE SHOULD HAVE MORE OF IT.

FOR IF, AS PROTECTIONISTS TELL US, OUR COUNTRY IS SO PROSPEROUS AND WAGES ARE SO HIGH BECAUSE OF THE PROTECTION WE ALREADY HAVE, THEN WE CERTAINLY OUGHT TO BEND ALL OUR EFFORTS TO GET MORE PROTECTION. HOWEVER PROSPEROUS THIS COUNTRY MAY BE WHEN VIEWED THROUGH THE ROSE COLORED SPECTACLES OF THE MILLIONAIRE, AND HOWEVER HIGH WAGES MAY BE FROM THE STANDPOINT OF THOSE WHO THINK THAT THE NATURAL WAGES OF LABOR ARE ONLY ENOUGH TO KEEP SOUL AND BODY TOGETHER, THERE WILL BE NO DISPUTE AMONG WORKMEN THAT THIS COUNTRY IS NOT PROSPEROUS ENOUGH AND WAGES NOT HIGH ENOUGH. WHOEVER MAY BE SATISFIED WITH THINGS AS THEY ARE, THE GREAT MASS OF AMERICAN CITIZENS WHO WORK FOR A LIVING ARE NOT SATISFIED AND OUGHT NOT TO BE SATISFIED. MONSTROUS FORTUNES ARE ROLLING UP HERE FASTER THAN THEY EVER DID IN THE WORLD BEFORE; BUT THE GREAT BODY OF THE AMERICAN PEOPLE GET A POOR HAND-TO-MOUTH LIVING, AND FIND YEAR AFTER YEAR PASSING WITHOUT ANYTHING LAID BY FOR A RAINY DAY. OUR RICH MEN ASTONISH THE RICH MEN OF EUROPE BY THEIR LAVISH EXPENDITURE, AND THE DAUGHTERS OF OUR MILLIONAIRES ARE SOUGHT IN MARRIAGE BY EUROPEAN ARISTOCRATS OF THE BLUET BLOOD; BUT THE TRAMP IS KNOWN FROM THE ATLANTIC TO THE PACIFIC; THE PROPORTION OF OUR PEOPLE WHO ARE MAINTAINED BY CHARITY, THE PROPORTION WHO ARE CONFINED IN PRISONS AND LUNATIC ASYLUMS, THE PROPORTION OF OUR WOMEN AND CHILDREN WHO MUST GO TO WORK, IS STEADILY INCREASING. AND THE PROPORTION OF MEN WHO, STARTING WITH NOTHING BUT THEIR ABILITY TO LABOR, CAN BECOME THEIR OWN EMPLOYERS, OR CAN HOPE OUT OF THE EARNINGS OF THEIR LABOR TO MAINTAIN A FAMILY AND PUT BY A COMPETENCE FOR OLD AGE, IS STEADILY DIMINISHING. "STATISTICIANS" MAY PILE UP FIGURES TO PROVE TO THE AMERICAN WORKMAN HOW MUCH BETTER OFF HE IS THAN HE USED TO BE, AND THE EDITORS OF PROTECTION PAPERS MAY PICTURE THE POVERTY OF EUROPEAN WORKMEN IN THE DARKEST COLORS TO SHOW HIM HOW PROUD AND HAPPY AND CONTENTED HE OUGHT TO BE. BUT THE LABOR ORGANIZATIONS, THE STRIKES, THE BITTER UNREST WITH WHICH THE WHOLE INDUSTRIAL MASS IS SEETHING, SHOW THAT HE IS NOT CONTENTED. IF PROTECTION GIVES PROSPERITY, IF PROTECTION RAISES WAGES, THEN IN HEAVEN'S NAME LET US DEMAND MORE PROTECTION, EVEN THOUGH WE URGENTLY DESTROY ALL FOREIGN COMMERCE AND PUT LINE OF CUSTOM HOUSES BETWEEN EVERY STATE, AND SHUT IN OUR RICH MEN SO THAT THEY CANNOT GO TO EUROPE AND SPEND THEIR MONEY ON FOREIGN PAUPERS AS MR. BLAINE IS DOING. BUT IF IT DOES NOT—THEN LET US SWEEP AWAY WHAT PROTECTION WE HAVE. LET US RAISE THE BANNER OF EQUAL RIGHTS, AND TRY TO RAISE THE WAGES OF ALL WORKMEN!

WHY WAGES ARE HIGHER IN AMERICA.

IT IS NOT PROTECTION THAT HAS MADE WAGES HIGHER HERE THAN IN EUROPE. IF PROTECTION COULD MAKE WAGES HIGH, WHY HAS IT NOT MADE WAGES HIGH IN GERMANY AND ITALY AND SPAIN AND MEXICO?

WHY DID IT NOT MAKE WAGES HIGH IN ENGLAND WHEN IT WAS IN FULL FORCE THERE? WAGES WERE HIGHER IN THE UNITED STATES THAN IN EUROPE BEFORE WE HAD ANY PROTECTION; AND IF THEY HAVE ON THE WHOLE REMAINED HIGHER, IT IS IN SPITE OF PROTECTION. OUR HIGHER WAGES ARE BECAUSE OF OUR CHEAPER LAND—BECAUSE LABOR CAN MORE READILY OBTAIN ACCESS TO THE NATURAL MATERIALS AND OPPORTUNITIES OF LABOR.

THE SECRET OF OUR PROSPERITY, OUR RAPID GROWTH, OUR BETTER CONDITIONS OF LABOR, IS SIMPLY THAT WE HAVE HAD THE TEMPERATE ZONE OF A VAST AND VIRGIN CONTINENT TO OVERRUN, AND THAT IT HAS TAKEN A LONG WHILE FOR MONOPOLY TO FENCE IT IN. AS IT IS GRADUALLY FENCED IN, AS THE TRIBUTE THAT LABOR MUST PAY TO MONOPOLY FOR THE USE OF LAND BECOMES HIGHER AND HIGHER, SO MUST OUR SOCIAL CONDITIONS, TARIFF OR NO TARIFF, APPROXIMATE TO THE SOCIAL CONDITIONS OF EUROPE.

WHAT LABOR NEEDS.

TO GIVE LABOR FULL FREEDOM; TO MAKE WAGES WHICH OUGHT TO BE, THE FULL EARNINGS OF LABOR; TO SECURE WORK FOR ALL, AND LEISURE FOR ALL, AND ABUNDANCE FOR ALL; TO ENJOY ALL THE ADVANTAGES AND BLESSINGS OF AN ADVANCING CIVILIZATION—WE MUST BREAK DOWN ALL MONOPOLIES AND DESTROY ALL SPECIAL PRIVILEGES.

THE REJECTION OF PROTECTION AND THE ABOLITION OF THE TARIFF WILL NOT OF ITSELF ACCOMPLISH THIS, BUT IT WILL BE A LONG STEP TOWARD IT—A STEP THAT MUST NECESSARILY BE TAKEN IF LABOR IS TO BE EMANCIPATED AND INDUSTRIAL SLAVERY

IS TO BE ABOLISHED. UNTIL THE WORKMEN OF THE UNITED STATES GET OVER THE DEGRADING SUPERSTITION OF PROTECTION THEY MUST BE DIVIDED AND HELPLESS. BUT WHEN THEY ONCE REALIZE THE TRUE DIGNITY OF LABOR, ONCE SEE THAT THE GOOD OF ALL CAN ONLY BE GAINED BY SECURING THE EQUAL RIGHTS OF EACH, THEN THEY CAN UNITE, AND THEN THEY WILL BE IRRESISTIBLE.

AND THIS IS THE QUESTION THAT YOU WILL BE ASKED THIS YEAR TO ANSWER BY YOUR VOTES. ARE YOU FOR RESTRICTION OR ARE YOU FOR FREEDOM? ARE YOU IN FAVOR OF TAXING THE WHOLE PEOPLE FOR THE BENEFIT OF A FEW CAPITALISTS, IN THE HOPE THAT THEY WILL GIVE TO THEIR WORKMEN SOME OF THE CRUMBS? OR ARE YOU AGAINST ALL SPECIAL PRIVILEGES AND IN FAVOR OF EQUAL RIGHTS TO ALL?

TO THE MAN WHO THINKS THE MATTER OVER THERE CAN BE NO QUESTION AS TO WHAT ANSWER BEST ACCORDS WITH THE INTERESTS OF WORKMEN. IT IS POSSIBLE FOR THE FEW TO BECOME RICH BY TAXING THE MANY. BUT IT IS NOT POSSIBLE FOR THE MANY TO BECOME RICH BY TAXING THEMSELVES TO PUT THE PROCEEDS IN THE HANDS OF THE FEW.

LABOR CANNOT BE HURT BY FREEDOM. THE ONLY THING THAT CAN BE HURT BY FREEDOM IS MONOPOLY. AND MONOPOLY MEANS THE ROBBERY OF LABOR.

LABOR NEEDS FREEDOM, NOT PROTECTION; JUSTICE, NOT CHARITY; EQUAL RIGHTS FOR ALL, NOT SPECIAL PRIVILEGES FOR SOME.

HENRY GEORGE'S WORKS.

PROGRESS AND POVERTY.

AN INQUIRY INTO THE CAUSE OF INDUSTRIAL DEPRESSION AND OF INCREASE OF WANT WITH INCREASE OF WEALTH—THE REMEDY.

BY HENRY GEORGE.

22 pages.

CONTENTS:

INTRODUCTORY—THE PROBLEM.

BOOK I.—WAGES AND CAPITAL.

BOOK II.—POPULATION AND SUBSISTENCE.

BOOK III.—THE LAWS OF DISTRIBUTION.

BOOK IV.—EFFECT OF MATERIAL PROGRESS UPON THE DISTRIBUTION OF WEALTH.

BOOK V.—THE PROBLEM SOLVED.

BOOK VI.—THE REMEDY.

BOOK VII.—JUSTICE OF THE REMEDY.

BOOK VIII.—APPLICATION OF THE REMEDY.

BOOK IX.—EFFECTS OF THE REMEDY.

BOOK X.—THE LAW OF HUMAN PROGRESS.

BOOK XI.—THE CURRENT OF HUMAN PROGRESS—ITS INFLUENCE.

BOOK XII.—THE LAW OF HUMAN PROGRESS—ITS DIRECTION.

BOOK XIII.—THE LAW OF HUMAN PROGRESS—ITS DECLINE.

BOOK XIV.—THE LAW OF HUMAN PROGRESS—ITS CENTRALITY.

BOOK XV.—THE LAW OF HUMAN PROGRESS—ITS INFLUENCE.

BOOK XVI.—THE LAW OF HUMAN PROGRESS—ITS DIRECTION.

BOOK XVII.—THE LAW OF HUMAN PROGRESS—ITS DECLINE.

BOOK XVIII.—THE LAW OF HUMAN PROGRESS—ITS CENTRALITY.

BOOK XVII.—THE LAW OF HUMAN PROGRESS—ITS INFLUENCE.

BOOK XVIII.—THE LAW OF HUMAN PROGRESS—ITS DIRECTION.

BOOK XVII.—THE LAW OF HUMAN PROGRESS—ITS DECLINE.

BOOK XVIII.—THE LAW OF HUMAN PROGRESS—ITS CENTRALITY.

BOOK XVII.—THE LAW OF HUMAN PROGRESS—ITS INFLUENCE.

BOOK XVIII.—THE LAW OF HUMAN PROGRESS—ITS DIRECTION.

BOOK XVII.—THE LAW OF HUMAN PROGRESS—ITS DECLINE.

BOOK XVIII.—THE LAW OF HUMAN PROGRESS—ITS CENTRALITY.

BOOK XVII.—THE LAW OF HUMAN PROGRESS—ITS INFLUENCE.

BOOK XVIII.—THE LAW OF HUMAN PROGRESS—ITS DIRECTION.

BOOK XVII.—THE LAW OF HUMAN PROGRESS—ITS DECLINE.

BOOK XVIII.—THE LAW OF HUMAN PROGRESS—ITS CENTRALITY.

BOOK XVII.—THE LAW OF HUMAN PROGRESS—ITS INFLUENCE.

BOOK XVIII.—THE LAW OF HUMAN PROGRESS—ITS DIRECTION.

BOOK XVII.—THE LAW OF HUMAN PROGRESS—ITS DECLINE.

BOOK XVIII.—THE LAW OF HUMAN PROGRESS—ITS CENTRALITY.

BOOK XVII.—THE LAW OF HUMAN PROGRESS—ITS INFLUENCE.

BOOK XVIII.—THE LAW OF HUMAN PROGRESS—ITS DIRECTION.

BOOK XVII.—THE LAW OF HUMAN PROGRESS—ITS DECLINE.

BOOK XVIII.—THE LAW OF HUMAN PROGRESS—ITS CENTRALITY.

BOOK XVII.—THE LAW OF HUMAN PROGRESS—ITS IN

## CURRENT THOUGHT.

In August last Dr. Howard Crosby published in the *Forum* an article under the title, "The Forgotten Cause of Poverty," in which he asserted "that the tap root of poverty among us is improvidence," and stated, after careful calculation, that a citizen of New York ought to be able to pay house rent and support a wife and family on a total expenditure of \$500 a year.

Apparently Dr. Crosby has of late seen a new light on the poverty question, since he now announces that a man with a capital of \$100,000 "needs all his income to live with the ordinary comforts of life." He makes this statement in an article entitled "The Haste to be Rich," which appears in the June issue of the *Forum*.

The object of Dr. Crosby's earlier essay, referred to above, was to inculcate the duty of accumulating wealth by the practice of the strictest abstinence—an abstention which should involve the repression of all impulses, however natural and praiseworthy, whose gratification might entail the spending of money. The American citizen beginning life with no other heritage than the equal right to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness, was advised for the first thirty years of his manhood to subordinate everything else to the saving of money, in order that by the time he reached the threshold of old age, he might be able, out of his savings, to purchase that which, in ruder and less wealthy communities, is considered the first essential of existence—a decent dwelling place for himself and family. The present essay, on the contrary, sets forth the evils of too keen seeking after wealth, and warns the reader of the inevitable moral degradation which results from making money the chief object of existence.

Dr. Crosby begins his article with an eloquent definition of happiness:

Happiness is contentment with surroundings, not the creature of surroundings. Its root is in the mind, not without. So all that my neighbor and half the world, who began their search for happiness from the cottage of happiness, and then steamed down to making the palace rather than the cottage, the creator of happiness, now can say is that contentment has a better soil to flourish in when in a palace than when in a cottage.

They have to grant that cottage happiness is as good as palace happiness, and that in each case there is contentment with surroundings; but they affirm that this contentment is better nurtured in a palace, and is more stable there. But are kings and dukes the happiest of men? History seems rather to make the last word concerning Responsibility produce risks. The higher you mount, a ship touches the greater fall. Moreover, where cares multiply anxieties intrude. We must not ignore all this because we see the prince pass by with a crown on his head and a retinue at his heels. It is an ignorant proletarian that looks up to royalty, and fails to see the human soul with its weakness under the velvet robes.

Punch printed a picture a year or so ago which was thought very funny. A prosperous looking rector of the church of England, taking his walls abroad, encounters a bear-eyed, palsied, half-naked wretch of a parishioner, who pours into his ears a dismal tale of poverty and suffering. "Yes, my poor fellow," says the rector, sympathetically, "you have a great deal to bear. But remember, the rich have their troubles, too. Now, I daresay you have no idea of the difficulty of finding an investment which combines adequate security with a decent rate of interest." Dr. Crosby reminds us somewhat of that rector. All that he says about the misery that riches entail on their possessor is perfectly true—so is what he says about the virtue of contentment. But to the vast majority of American citizens his words convey no more meaning than would the statement of a proposition in the higher mathematics. Men whose lives are passed, as are the lives of most Americans, in a constant struggle with actual or possible poverty, are of necessity deaf to arguments of this description. They listen, and they simply don't believe. They cannot believe. As soon expect a boat load of starving sailors to have a realising sense of the evil results of overeating.

Another evil in the gold hunt is that which is practised on the community. We have seen how it shrivels the man who hunts. Now let us see how it harms the public. The healthiest form of human society is where the many are equally independent in their management of their affairs. There are professions and trades, however, performed by individuals, and in minds, and where they are engaged in any one branch of industry stand on a level with one another. This condition of things promotes invention, activity, interest, manliness, and good citizenship. Now, the gold hunt system is directly antagonistic to all this. It seeks to destroy the many independent tradesmen, and to make their servants in a gigantic monopoly. The happy homes of freemen become the pinched quarters of serfs. The lords of trade have their hundreds and thousands of minute subordinates, over whom they rule, often with a rod of iron. They may be fanned away from work and wages at any moment, from any whim of the selfish employer. Hence, through fear of this they lose their manhood, and dare not assert even a decision of their conscience. There is no more melancholy sight to my eyes than that which I so often see nowadays, the former happy possessor of a shop or store, who has lived comfortably and with the true nobility of a citizen, and whose family has felt the dignity of the home, now naked, wretched, and disgraced, a huge establishment, that by its pretences usurped and overthrown all the independent stores of a large district, while his family are thrust into the unsavory communism of a tenement house, and lose all the delicate refinements of a quiet home. It is easy to say that this is but the natural law of trade. So to devour men is the natural law of tigers. But this truth will not reconcile us to the process. If we are to stop men from stealing indirectly, we can stop them from stealing directly. If natural law works evil to the community, we are to make statute law, which will act as super-natural law, and control the offensive principle.

What amazing proposition is this? If natural law—that is, the law of God—works evil we poor finite creatures must improve on the work of the All Wise and make laws which shall counteract His evil ordinances! Truly the Rev. Howard Crosby doesn't lack confidence in his own wisdom, small as is his faith in the deity whose altar he serves! Does Dr. Crosby believe that God meant men to live in tenement houses—that He meant "the happy homes of freemen" to become "the pinched quarters of serfs"?—that He meant men to "lose their manhood" and become so cowed that they "dare not assert even a decision of their consciences"? Surely not. If he will but think a moment he will acknowledge that all the misery he so deplores must spring from disobedience to natural law, and cannot possibly have formed part of the scheme of creation. And once seeing this he will see that what we have to do is not to try to frame better laws by photographic

God's, but to discover wherein we have already contravened them. And once started on that line of investigation Dr. Crosby will not have far to go.

Indeed, how close to his vision lies the truth, if he would but raise his eyes and look toward it, is evident when Dr. Crosby tells us what remedy he proposes:

Unless we wish our old social equality destroyed and a system of practical servitude taken its place, we must put a limit to the acts of greed, and so prevent the independence of the multitude. The liberties of the multitude are to be guarded, the liberty of one man to buy up all the land or all the dry goods in the market must be checked. Capital must be circumscribed, except under special circumstances, when special conditions should be made for the protection of the community.

There is no difference between buying up all the land and buying up all the dry goods?—no difference between owning all the wheat and owning all the farms?—no difference between owning all the fish in the market and owning all the seas and rivers from which alone fish can be produced? Dr. Crosby does not see any. But that is only because he will not look.

Such homilies as Dr. Crosby's are as old as history. How long is it since Solomon exclaimed: "Give me neither poverty nor riches; feed me with food convenient for me; lest I be full and deny thee, and say, Who is the Lord? or lest I be poor and steal?" It is the poverty that causes the stealing—the dread of remaining poor, or becoming poor, that induces the "haste to be rich" which Dr. Crosby laments. If poverty be, as we believe, a social disease to be eradicated, the lust for wealth will vanish with it. But if it be, as Dr. Crosby seems to think, a divine ordinance, we must just make the best of it, and submit to see the "gold hunt" go on uninterruptedly. Dr. Crosby's socialistic remedies can do nothing to help us.

Thomas A. Edison gives in the *North American Review* for June an account of his now perfected phonograph, which is well worth reading. Referring to an article in the *North American* of May-June, 1878, in which the possibilities of the then crude invention were foreshadowed, he says:

In my article ten years ago, I enumerated among the uses to which the phonograph would be applied: 1. Letter writing and all kinds of dictation without the aid of a stenographer. 2. Photographic books, which would speak to blind people without effort on their part. 3. The teaching of elocution. Reproduction of music. 4. The "family record," a record of family reminiscences, made by members of a family in their own voices, and of the last words of dying persons. 5. Music boxes and toys. 6. Clocks that should announce in articulate speech the time for going home, going to meals, etc. 7. The preservation of languages, by exact reproduction of the manner of pronouncing. 8. Educational purposes, such as preserving the explanations made by a teacher, so that the pupil can refer to them at any moment, and spelling or other lessons placed upon the phonograph for convenience in connecting with the teacher. 9. Connecting with the telephone, so as to make that invention an auxiliary in the transmission of permanent and invaluable records, instead of being the recipient of momentary and fleeting communications.

Every one of these uses the perfected phonograph is now ready to carry out. I may add that, through the facility with which it stores up and reproduces music of all sorts, or whistling and recitations, it can be employed to furnish constant amusement to invalids, or to social assemblies, at receptions, dinners, etc. Any one sitting in his room can then order an accurate supply of wax cylinders, interspersed with various piano or violin music, short stories, anecdote or direct pieces, and, by putting them on his phonograph, he can listen to them originally sung or recited by authors, vocalists and actors, or elocutionists. The variety of entertainment he thus commands, at trifling expense and without moving from his chair, is practically unlimited. Music by a band, in fact whole operas, can be stored up on the cylinders, and the voice of Patti singing in Italy should be heard again on the side of the ocean, or present for future generations. Young children, in a room with a diameter of five feet, can put the whole of "Nicholas Nickleby" in phonogram form. In teaching the correct pronunciation of English, and especially of foreign languages, the phonograph as it stands seems to be beyond comparison, for no system of phonetic spelling can convey to the pupil the pronunciation of a good English, French, German or Spanish speaker so well as a machine that reproduces his utterances, even more exactly than a human imitator could.

One You have to do is to Hold On and Let the Growing Population Make Your Fortune.

The following is from the pen of Benjamin L. Cohen, secretary of the Portland trust company, a board of trade: "Investments in real estate present many attractive features. There is nothing of the bogus character about Portland. Values are fixed, lots and blocks are stable as sugar or flour; but the charm of real estate purchases consists in the fact that the rise in city property from year to year is so regular and steady that, knowing the purchase price of a piece of property in 1888, one can predict with almost mathematical certainty the price for which it will sell in 1890. Property within the city limits, but on the boundary or in sparsely built-up portions, is now in about as much value in average rate per annum. Such property can still be bought for moderate prices as compared with other cities. For example, lots which in the summer of 1887 could be bought at \$1,350 to \$1,500 now readily sell for \$1,800 to \$2,000. A lot in Portland is 50x100 feet. Acre property near at hand and easily accessible has increased in value more rapidly. Unimproved lots in the central portions of the city increase more slowly, the real demand for such property having declined, prices some time ago to something like their real value. About twelve per cent per annum would be a conservative estimate of the present rate of increase of business lots. Of course there are many opportunities for speculative purchases which yield much larger returns. This article is confined to such investments as cautious, or even timid, capitalists would feel safe in handling."

At You have to do is to Hold On and Let the Growing Population Make Your Fortune.

The following is from the pen of Benjamin L. Cohen, secretary of the Portland trust company, a board of trade: "Investments in real estate present many attractive features. There is nothing of the bogus character about Portland. Values are fixed, lots and blocks are stable as sugar or flour; but the charm of real estate purchases consists in the fact that the rise in city property from year to year is so regular and steady that, knowing the purchase price of a piece of property in 1888, one can predict with almost mathematical certainty the price for which it will sell in 1890. Property within the city limits, but on the boundary or in sparsely built-up portions, is now in about as much value in average rate per annum. Such property can still be bought for moderate prices as compared with other cities. For example, lots which in the summer of 1887 could be bought at \$1,350 to \$1,500 now readily sell for \$1,800 to \$2,000. A lot in Portland is 50x100 feet. Acre property near at hand and easily accessible has increased in value more rapidly. Unimproved lots in the central portions of the city increase more slowly, the real demand for such property having declined, prices some time ago to something like their real value. About twelve per cent per annum would be a conservative estimate of the present rate of increase of business lots. Of course there are many opportunities for speculative purchases which yield much larger returns. This article is confined to such investments as cautious, or even timid, capitalists would feel safe in handling."

At You have to do is to Hold On and Let the Growing Population Make Your Fortune.

The following is from the pen of Benjamin L. Cohen, secretary of the Portland trust company, a board of trade: "Investments in real estate present many attractive features. There is nothing of the bogus character about Portland. Values are fixed, lots and blocks are stable as sugar or flour; but the charm of real estate purchases consists in the fact that the rise in city property from year to year is so regular and steady that, knowing the purchase price of a piece of property in 1888, one can predict with almost mathematical certainty the price for which it will sell in 1890. Property within the city limits, but on the boundary or in sparsely built-up portions, is now in about as much value in average rate per annum. Such property can still be bought for moderate prices as compared with other cities. For example, lots which in the summer of 1887 could be bought at \$1,350 to \$1,500 now readily sell for \$1,800 to \$2,000. A lot in Portland is 50x100 feet. Acre property near at hand and easily accessible has increased in value more rapidly. Unimproved lots in the central portions of the city increase more slowly, the real demand for such property having declined, prices some time ago to something like their real value. About twelve per cent per annum would be a conservative estimate of the present rate of increase of business lots. Of course there are many opportunities for speculative purchases which yield much larger returns. This article is confined to such investments as cautious, or even timid, capitalists would feel safe in handling."

At You have to do is to Hold On and Let the Growing Population Make Your Fortune.

The following is from the pen of Benjamin L. Cohen, secretary of the Portland trust company, a board of trade: "Investments in real estate present many attractive features. There is nothing of the bogus character about Portland. Values are fixed, lots and blocks are stable as sugar or flour; but the charm of real estate purchases consists in the fact that the rise in city property from year to year is so regular and steady that, knowing the purchase price of a piece of property in 1888, one can predict with almost mathematical certainty the price for which it will sell in 1890. Property within the city limits, but on the boundary or in sparsely built-up portions, is now in about as much value in average rate per annum. Such property can still be bought for moderate prices as compared with other cities. For example, lots which in the summer of 1887 could be bought at \$1,350 to \$1,500 now readily sell for \$1,800 to \$2,000. A lot in Portland is 50x100 feet. Acre property near at hand and easily accessible has increased in value more rapidly. Unimproved lots in the central portions of the city increase more slowly, the real demand for such property having declined, prices some time ago to something like their real value. About twelve per cent per annum would be a conservative estimate of the present rate of increase of business lots. Of course there are many opportunities for speculative purchases which yield much larger returns. This article is confined to such investments as cautious, or even timid, capitalists would feel safe in handling."

At You have to do is to Hold On and Let the Growing Population Make Your Fortune.

The following is from the pen of Benjamin L. Cohen, secretary of the Portland trust company, a board of trade: "Investments in real estate present many attractive features. There is nothing of the bogus character about Portland. Values are fixed, lots and blocks are stable as sugar or flour; but the charm of real estate purchases consists in the fact that the rise in city property from year to year is so regular and steady that, knowing the purchase price of a piece of property in 1888, one can predict with almost mathematical certainty the price for which it will sell in 1890. Property within the city limits, but on the boundary or in sparsely built-up portions, is now in about as much value in average rate per annum. Such property can still be bought for moderate prices as compared with other cities. For example, lots which in the summer of 1887 could be bought at \$1,350 to \$1,500 now readily sell for \$1,800 to \$2,000. A lot in Portland is 50x100 feet. Acre property near at hand and easily accessible has increased in value more rapidly. Unimproved lots in the central portions of the city increase more slowly, the real demand for such property having declined, prices some time ago to something like their real value. About twelve per cent per annum would be a conservative estimate of the present rate of increase of business lots. Of course there are many opportunities for speculative purchases which yield much larger returns. This article is confined to such investments as cautious, or even timid, capitalists would feel safe in handling."

At You have to do is to Hold On and Let the Growing Population Make Your Fortune.

The following is from the pen of Benjamin L. Cohen, secretary of the Portland trust company, a board of trade: "Investments in real estate present many attractive features. There is nothing of the bogus character about Portland. Values are fixed, lots and blocks are stable as sugar or flour; but the charm of real estate purchases consists in the fact that the rise in city property from year to year is so regular and steady that, knowing the purchase price of a piece of property in 1888, one can predict with almost mathematical certainty the price for which it will sell in 1890. Property within the city limits, but on the boundary or in sparsely built-up portions, is now in about as much value in average rate per annum. Such property can still be bought for moderate prices as compared with other cities. For example, lots which in the summer of 1887 could be bought at \$1,350 to \$1,500 now readily sell for \$1,800 to \$2,000. A lot in Portland is 50x100 feet. Acre property near at hand and easily accessible has increased in value more rapidly. Unimproved lots in the central portions of the city increase more slowly, the real demand for such property having declined, prices some time ago to something like their real value. About twelve per cent per annum would be a conservative estimate of the present rate of increase of business lots. Of course there are many opportunities for speculative purchases which yield much larger returns. This article is confined to such investments as cautious, or even timid, capitalists would feel safe in handling."

At You have to do is to Hold On and Let the Growing Population Make Your Fortune.

The following is from the pen of Benjamin L. Cohen, secretary of the Portland trust company, a board of trade: "Investments in real estate present many attractive features. There is nothing of the bogus character about Portland. Values are fixed, lots and blocks are stable as sugar or flour; but the charm of real estate purchases consists in the fact that the rise in city property from year to year is so regular and steady that, knowing the purchase price of a piece of property in 1888, one can predict with almost mathematical certainty the price for which it will sell in 1890. Property within the city limits, but on the boundary or in sparsely built-up portions, is now in about as much value in average rate per annum. Such property can still be bought for moderate prices as compared with other cities. For example, lots which in the summer of 1887 could be bought at \$1,350 to \$1,500 now readily sell for \$1,800 to \$2,000. A lot in Portland is 50x100 feet. Acre property near at hand and easily accessible has increased in value more rapidly. Unimproved lots in the central portions of the city increase more slowly, the real demand for such property having declined, prices some time ago to something like their real value. About twelve per cent per annum would be a conservative estimate of the present rate of increase of business lots. Of course there are many opportunities for speculative purchases which yield much larger returns. This article is confined to such investments as cautious, or even timid, capitalists would feel safe in handling."

At You have to do is to Hold On and Let the Growing Population Make Your Fortune.

The following is from the pen of Benjamin L. Cohen, secretary of the Portland trust company, a board of trade: "Investments in real estate present many attractive features. There is nothing of the bogus character about Portland. Values are fixed, lots and blocks are stable as sugar or flour; but the charm of real estate purchases consists in the fact that the rise in city property from year to year is so regular and steady that, knowing the purchase price of a piece of property in 1888, one can predict with almost mathematical certainty the price for which it will sell in 1890. Property within the city limits, but on the boundary or in sparsely built-up portions, is now in about as much value in average rate per annum. Such property can still be bought for moderate prices as compared with other cities. For example, lots which in the summer of 1887 could be bought at \$1,350 to \$1,500 now readily sell for \$1,800 to \$2,000. A lot in Portland is 50x100 feet. Acre property near at hand and easily accessible has increased in value more rapidly. Unimproved lots in the central portions of the city increase more slowly, the real demand for such property having declined, prices some time ago to something like their real value. About twelve per cent per annum would be a conservative estimate of the present rate of increase of business lots. Of course there are many opportunities for speculative purchases which yield much larger returns. This article is confined to such investments as cautious, or even timid, capitalists would feel safe in handling."

At You have to do is to Hold On and Let the Growing Population Make Your Fortune.

The following is from the pen of Benjamin L. Cohen, secretary of the Portland trust company, a board of trade: "Investments in real estate present many attractive features. There is nothing of the bogus character about Portland. Values are fixed, lots and blocks are stable as sugar or flour; but the charm of real estate purchases consists in the fact that the rise in city property from year to year is so regular and steady that, knowing the purchase price of a piece of property in 1888, one can predict with almost mathematical certainty the price for which it will sell in 1890. Property within the city limits, but on the boundary or in sparsely built-up portions, is now in about as much value in average rate per annum. Such property can still be bought for moderate prices as compared with other cities. For example, lots which in the summer of 1887 could be bought at \$1,350 to \$1,500 now readily sell for \$1,800 to \$2,000. A lot in Portland is 50x100 feet. Acre property near at hand and easily accessible has increased in value more rapidly. Unimproved lots in the central portions of the city increase more slowly, the real demand for such property having declined, prices some time ago to something like their real value. About twelve per cent per annum would be a conservative estimate of the present rate of increase of business lots. Of course there are many opportunities for speculative purchases which yield much larger returns. This article is confined to such investments as cautious, or even timid, capitalists would feel safe in handling."

At You have to do is to Hold On and Let the Growing Population Make Your Fortune.

The following is from the pen of Benjamin L. Cohen, secretary of the Portland trust company, a board of trade: "Investments in real estate present many attractive features. There is nothing of the bogus character about Portland. Values are fixed, lots and blocks are stable as sugar or flour; but the charm of real estate purchases consists in the fact that the rise in city property from year to year is so regular and steady that, knowing the purchase price of a piece of property in 1888, one can predict with almost mathematical certainty the price for which it will sell in 1890. Property within the city limits, but on the boundary or in sparsely built-up portions, is now in about as much value in average rate per annum. Such property can still be bought for moderate prices as compared with other cities. For example, lots which in the summer of 1887 could be bought at \$1,350 to \$1,500 now readily sell for \$1,800 to \$2,000. A lot in Portland is 50x100 feet. Acre property near at hand and easily accessible has increased in value more rapidly. Unimproved lots in the central portions of the city increase more slowly, the real demand for such property having declined, prices some time ago to something like their real value. About twelve per cent per annum would be a conservative estimate of the present rate of increase of business lots. Of course there are many opportunities for speculative purchases which yield much larger returns. This article is confined to such investments as cautious, or even timid, capitalists would feel safe in handling."

At You have to do is to Hold On and Let the Growing Population Make Your Fortune.

The following is from the pen of Benjamin L. Cohen, secretary of the Portland trust company, a board of trade: "Investments in real estate present many attractive features. There is nothing of the bogus character about Portland. Values are fixed, lots and blocks are stable as sugar or flour; but the charm of real estate purchases consists in the fact that the rise in city property from year to year is so regular and steady that, knowing the purchase price of a piece of property in 1888, one can predict with almost mathematical certainty the price for which it will sell in 1890. Property within the city limits, but on the boundary or in sparsely built-up portions, is now in about as much value in average rate per annum. Such property can still be bought for moderate prices as compared with other cities. For example, lots which in the summer of 1887 could be bought at \$1,350 to \$1,500 now readily sell for \$1,800 to \$2,000. A lot in Portland is 50x100 feet. Acre property near at hand and easily accessible has increased in value more rapidly. Unimproved lots in the central portions of the city increase more slowly